YER
IA
AP

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 482 UD 022 469

AUTHOR Kapel, David E.; Kapel, Marilyn B.
TITLE The Preparation of Teachers for the Urban Schools: The State-of-the-Art in Pre-Service and In-Service Education. Part I. ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series Number 81.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 82
CONTRACT 400-77-9971
NOTE 83p.; For related document see UD 022 470.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 ($5.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Research Needs; *School Effectiveness; *Social Influences; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; Urban Education; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This monograph reviews research and educational reports to examine the state of the art in preservice and inservice teacher education in the urban community in the United States. A review of urban areas in the last thirty years reveals major social and environmental changes, such as population increases, shifts in racial composition, the introduction of desegregation, and declining resources which have required unique responses to urban educational needs. Examination of how teachers have responded to the changes indicates factors that make for effective teachers and effective schools in urban areas. An exploration of preservice education programs for urban communities emphasizes the importance of urban-based field training and provides descriptions of selected innovations developed by American higher education institutions to improve their preservice education programs. An investigation of inservice programs for urban education identifies inservice education needs and goals, reviews the history of inservice urban education programs, identifies models and types of inservice programs being carried out by various urban school districts, and identifies problems and needs of inservice educational research and evaluation. Finally, prospects for further improving urban schools through teacher training based on what is known about urban change and effective urban education are considered. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219482

THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR THE URBAN SCHOOLS: THE STATE-OF-THE-ART IN PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

By

David E. Kapel
University of Louisville

and

Marilyn B. Kapel
Eliahu Academy and Bellarmine College
Louisville, Kentucky

ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series
Number 81, July 1982
PART I

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

UD 022 469

This publication is one in the ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education under contract between the National Institute of Education, United State Department of Education and Teachers College, Columbia University. Additional copies will be available from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210

Its ED identification number and full ordering instructions will be found in RESOURCES IN EDUCATION, the monthly ERIC abstract journal, or can be obtained by contacting ERIC/CUE.

Copies are also available from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York, 10027, for $5.00 each.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number 400-77-9971. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department of Education.

Introduction

At the present time, the 50 largest school districts in this country serve one sixth of all publicly educated students. If one includes private school students and those who do not finish their education, these urban districts embrace one quarter of the school-age population (Gappert, 1981). It is painfully apparent that education in the urban community has impacted and will continue to impact greatly on the future of education in this country.

It is the intention of this monograph to examine the state-of-the-art of both pre- and in-service education as it relates to the urban community. After a brief review of the three most recent decades of education in urban communities and teacher education's response, and an examination of teacher and school effectiveness factors, this report will take an indepth look at the present status of both pre- and in-service education in this country. Based upon available data, suggestions and predictions as to the future needs and thrusts of urban education will be offered.

As part of the development of this monograph, the authors surveyed institutions of higher education and urban school districts throughout the United States for information on current pre- and in-service education programs that are responsive to the needs and conditions of urban schools. Information culled from the two surveys is found in a companion publication titled: The Preparation of Teachers for the Urban Schools: Selected Programs Offered by Institutions of Higher Education and Urban School Districts. (Urban Diversity Series, Number 81, Part II).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..... i

I. A Retrospective Look at Education in the Urban Environment..... 1

A. Overview..... 1

B. Teacher Education Responses..... 6

C. Summation 7

II. Teacher and School Effectiveness Factors..... 8

A. The Effective Teacher..... 8

B. The Effective School..... 17

Leadership..... 17

School Learning Climate..... 19

C. Summation..... 22

III. The State-of-the-Art: Pre-Service Education for the Urban Community..... 23

A. Overview..... 23

B. Selected Innovations and Programs..... 28

IV. The State-of-the-Art: In-Service Education for the Urban Community..... 33

A. Definition..... 33

B. Needs and Goals..... 34

C. History..... 40

D. Models and Types..... 43

E. Research and Evaluation in In-Service Programs..... 53

V. A Backward Glance with a Forward Thrust..... 58

References..... 65

I. A Retrospective Look at Education in the Urban Environment

A. Overview

It is not universally accepted that there needs to be or should be a unique and specific preparation of teachers for urban schools. Should teachers, instead, be trained to accommodate any teaching environment and/or situation? This latter approach appears to be highly simplistic; it is similar to the view, as described by Ornstein (1982), that urban problems are "annoyances and inconveniences." Generic teacher training does not recognize the major changes of the last 30 years that specifically affected education in urban schools: the 1950's court decisions that established the legal base for the destruction of the de jure dual educational systems existing in some communities and that led ultimately to the use of busing for desegregation purposes; the 1960's with the "War on Poverty," massive federal funding (for example, the elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, especially Title I that focused on children from low-income families, Bilingual Education, Head Start, and Follow-Through), massive changes in the nature of student populations, the development of alternative schools, and the general social unrest that existed in the country; and the 1970's in which there was continued federal funding (although by the end of the decade the level of federal funding was beginning to change), a reduction in the urban school tax base, the beginning of the decline of the school-age population, teacher surpluses, the absorption of many of the changes created in the 1960's, expansion of the magnet school concept, a general evaluation and re-evaluation of education in the urban environment, and a recognition that education in the urban environment, and a recognition that education cannot

solve the social problems of an ever changing urban society--problems for which solutions can be found only through the cooperation of many segments of the society.

Although de jure segregation was declared unconstitutional in 1954-55 (Brown I, May 16, 1954; Brown II, May 31, 1955), actual desegregation within the nation's schools did not occur in earnest until the next decade. The Supreme Court decision to uphold busing as a means of desegregation (Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, April 20, 1971) facilitated this thrust. It should be noted that an ensuing Supreme Court decision restricted the full use and potential of busing as a tool for desegregation (Milliken v. Bradley, July 25, 1974). However, these court decisions did have an impact on the nature of students found in the urban schools. Considerable middle-class (predominantly white) flight to suburbia occurred before and during school desegregation (Pettigrew and Green, 1979; Rossell, 1979; Ravitch, 1979). Consequently, by the end of the 1970's, the urban schools were inherited by the poor, the blacks, and other minority groups (especially non-English-speaking minorities who had recently migrated to the United States). There was an ever-increasing social-racial imbalance between the urban school and its surrounding community school population.

Not only were teachers facing different types of children, but the entire urban environment had changed. These changes were bound to affect the classroom and school. Middle-class "flight" resulted in an urban tax drain. There was a depression in the tax rateables of urban communities--one of the traditional sources of tax support for the urban schools. Also, there was a change in the political makeup of the cities. The middle-class dominance was being challenged by those who no longer grew

up in "traditional" cultures and social class. New demands from the challengers were being felt not only by city government, but also by the urban school structure.

During the 1960's and 1970's attempts were made by schools to meet the needs of the changing urban environment. During the decade of the late 60's and early 70's, alternative schools developed in many urban school districts. Probably one of the most famous of these is the Parkway School in Philadelphia. Even within schools, at that time, many alternative programs such as reading intervention centers, bilingual programs, and gifted and talented programs were made available. There were alternative programs that were single mission in nature too, for example, consumer education, teenage parenting, career education, outdoor education, and even "traditional" back-to-the-basics programs.

Although expanded for desegregation purposes in the 1970's (Grant, 1982; McIntire, Hughes, and Say, 1982), the magnet schools have established themselves as an important educational/curricular school organization in many urban communities. Schools for students who want to work in clothing and textiles, visual and performing arts, science and mathematics, and even farming are available in some cities. Most often these schools are available to students regardless of where they live in the city.

In a further attempt to meet the changing educational and political needs of the urban community, school districts such as New York City and Philadelphia attempted to decentralize their district-wide administration. At the same time, community action groups, taking their lead from the "War on Poverty" (OEO), became both political and social forces in major cities and in the schools. As a result, oftentimes an antagonistic

situation arose between the urban schools and the community served. In reaction to this unsettling climate and to defend themselves, teacher organizations began to act in a more militant fashion. Teacher strikes occurred in major cities; these strikes were a function of changes in both teacher economic conditions and social-political power struggles within the district's urban community. Such antagonisms and conflicts served to illustrate the gap that existed between the community and the schools, make each group more defensive and often more militant, and disrupt schools and teaching. Conversely, these situations tended to illustrate the changes in the structure of the community, bring out the different perceptions groups had about the goals of education in the urban community, create dialogue (although at times hostile) between the community and the schools, and focus on the uniqueness of urban schools and urban teaching.

Such drastic changes in urban student populations and teaching environment are not unique to this time period. Our history shows these phenomena to have occurred before. At the turn of this century an influx of non-English-speaking immigrants rendered the urban schools ineffectual, not only in terms of what was being taught (the curriculum) but also in terms of how it was taught. Although there were curricular changes toward practical education (for example, the study of mathematics became more functional and applied) and recognition that children from non-English-speaking families might have some problems, the educated middle class still controlled and wielded power in the schools. The change in the urban community in the 1960's and 70's reflected an absence of a large middle class, politically as well as economically and socially. In addition, teacher status within the community has declined.

Immigrants at the turn of the century generally reflected the existing middle class respect for the instructor. Miller, as cited by Gappert (1981), indicates that in the 1960's and 70's the social distance between students and teachers had broadened. Their home communities are very dissimilar as are their values and expectations. Today's minorities and urban poor still view the schools as a means of economic and social survival. However, expectations of the present urban population demand a new relationship between schools and the population served and between teachers and the students taught--that is, there is a greater demand for shared decision making in urban schools. The new relationship has affected the urban school and consequently the classroom teacher.

The large federal intervention strategies of the 1960's and early 70's (such programs as ESEA Title I, Head Start, Follow Through, and so on) were evaluated during the last decade. Passow (1982, pp. 520-521) reported "a mixed bag" of results for the Title I programs and positive results for pre-school education programs. The Consortium for Longitudinal Studies completed a study of Head Start, and their findings challenged the negative Westinghouse findings (Lewis, 1982; Passow, 1982). They found that Head Start children were less likely to be placed in special classes, or to be retained in grades, and were achieving more in mathematics. Passow also reported that in 1981 large school districts found their students in the lower grades (K-8) achieving on standardized tests at the national average or above in greater numbers than in the early 1970's. The question of whether the results are a function of federal intervention strategies is moot; what is important is that students from large urban communities can achieve at and above the national

average.

It was during the 1970's that the school-age population began to decline as a result of the declining birth rate of the 1960's. The teacher shortage of the 1960's, with its influx of new teachers and new ideas, had become, in the 1970's and in the 1980's, a teacher surplus (Frankel, 1978; Grant and Eiden, 1981). Urban schools are not hiring new teachers and many are RIFing (reduction-in-force) teachers because their funding is based on enrollment and the student population is not there (Elfenbein, 1978). In the 1950's and the 1960's, the average teacher was leaving the profession after only 3 years of practice. This is not the case today; it is not uncommon for school districts to have average "employment ages" of 12-15 years. Such a situation can lead to educational stagnation and a lack of infusion of new ideas, since new teachers are not being hired. Urban school districts are not only losing the innovations of the entering teacher, but the older teacher is faced with new problems not addressed in earlier training. Clearly, the aging teacher population and the contracting employment market affects teacher education in two ways: (1) a weak employment market has affected the number and quality of individuals entering pre-service teacher education programs (Weaver, 1981), and (2) there is greater stress by universities, colleges, and school districts on in-service education.

B. Teacher Education Responses

University and college teacher education has responded to the changes in urban schools by offering programs in bilingual education, integrating multicultural education into pre- and in-service teacher education programs (particularly NCATE approved programs), and offering

extensive pre-service experiences in urban settings.

In the 1970's and early 1980's, universities, colleges, and school districts developed extensive in-service thrusts in reaction to the changing urban environment, the "graying" of the teacher staffs in urban schools, and the needs as perceived by teachers themselves.

In spite of teacher education attempts to meet the urban challenge, it appears that urban education in the foreseeable future will remain in a state of flux, due to a great extent on the nature of the urban community and the myriad of problems and factors that affect the urban community and consequently affect urban schools. Educators have yet to fully define and/or appreciate the social, economic, and political factors that impinge on urban education. Much of the failure to recognize such factors is historical in nature. Educators are just now beginning to recognize them (Chase, 1978, 1980; Ornstein, 1982; Passow, 1982; Watson, 1979) and are urging their colleagues to join other facets of the urban society in solving problems and developing urban policies. Such an approach has been summarized by Chase (1978):

1. Urban schools must be viewed as an integral part of other systems. This ecological perspective would include the political, economic, and social arenas.

2. At present, there is little consensus about the development of priorities for the revitalization of urban education as a component of urban policy.

3. Prospects for a new wave of urban reform are brighter--many inner cities are going through some revitalizations. Unfortunately, it is too soon to assess the impact of this phenomenon upon the urban public education scene.

C. Summation

Urban schools across this country have endured drastic changes in the last 30 years. Unlike similar occurrences at other junctions of

our history, this shift has resulted in some permanent structural changes in the fabric of urban education. Chase (1978) summarizes the situation most succinctly:

1. There has been a loss of population, wealth, and jobs in urban areas.
2. Cities have had to absorb large numbers of new minorities and high-need individuals.
3. Court-ordered desegregation has been a factor of contention.
4. Test scores have emerged as political indicators of school performance.
5. A very complex and diverse funding schematic has developed.
6. Resources are declining--this seriously affects budgetary considerations.

Urban education of the 80's will necessitate unprecedented support. Crises, such as those that occurred in Chicago, New York City, Cleveland, and Boston all forced state intervention. With changes in federal funding and intervention strategies, it is projected that the state's role in urban education will, by necessity, increase. Broad-based local support and leadership will also have to assume more of a role in the improvement of education in the urban environment as we move further into the 80's.

II. Teacher and School Effectiveness Factors

A. The Effective Teacher

The 1970's saw an increased interest in teacher effectiveness (Feiman, 1981; Gage, 1977; Lanier and Glassberg, 1981; Medley, 1977, 1978). One approach used in the research on teacher effectiveness is called process-product; that research focuses on the relationships of teachers' behaviors in the classroom to student outcomes.

Process-product studies are correlational, with independent variables being specific teacher behaviors and dependent variables being student performance measures (Rosenshine and Furst, 1971, p. 42). As reasonable as the approach appears, there are many problems in trying to relate general and broad experiences generated by process-product studies (Brophy and Evertson, 1974; Fisher et al., 1978; Good and Grouws, 1975; McDonald et al., 1975; Rosenshine, 1976; Soar and Soar, 1972) to meaningful and specific generic teacher behaviors. The least of the problems is the very nature of process-product studies. They tend to be restrictive in their scope and design (for example, limited generalizations; not experimental, thus "cause and effect" are difficult to isolate). In addition, it is rare that such research (or for that matter, most quantitative educational research) can identify specific teacher actions and behaviors (Borich, 1979; Taylor, 1981; Zahorik, 1981). Yet, process-product research has helped to focus teacher effectiveness research, and it has called into question many long held beliefs of teacher educators and classroom teachers.

For example, Rosenshine and Furst (1971, pp. 54-55) reported that: (1) clarity, (2) variability of teaching methods and modes, (3) enthusiasm, (4) task orientation on the part of the teacher or having a business-like behavior, and (5) student opportunity to learn (particularly cognitive learning) were significantly related to learning. Use of student ideas and/or teacher indirectness, use of criticism, use of structuring comments, use of multiple levels of discourse, probing, and perceived difficulty of the course were less important variables. In fact, increased criticism caused decreased achievement. Such prized virtues in teaching as nonverbal approval, praise, warmth, ratio of indirect

to direct teacher behaviors, flexibility, teacher talk, student talk, student participation, student/teacher interaction, absence (teacher, student), teacher experience, and teacher knowledge of subject were not shown to have a significant effect on student achievement.

Researchers in the later 1970's began to cull, from the process-product research and other types of research, broader behaviors that mark the effective teacher, rather than continuing to focus on very specific behaviors. Borich (1979) reviewed the major process-product research cited by Medley (1977) in his review of 289 such studies. He found that: (1) teacher questioning should focus on student needs; (2) there is definite value in teaching a class as a whole; (3) specialized tests and materials have value in the classroom; (4) lower SES children benefit more from praise than do higher SES children; (5) rules in the classroom should be flexible; (6) teacher control of student response and more teacher structure of student behavior proved to be beneficial to lower SES than higher SES children, while greater control had a negative effect on higher order cognitive learning; (7) teacher-student interaction had a positive effect during group instruction and negative effect under non-group instruction; (8) low SES students benefited more from highly affective teachers than did higher SES students; (9) time-on-task behavior of students is important; (10) students should be encouraged to ask questions; (11) teacher clarity is important--depending on the subject matter; (12) getting and keeping student attention is extremely important; and finally (13) the type of feedback a student receives from a teacher can affect achievement, with feedback on substance (content) being positive while feedback effect on non-substantive concerns is a function of the context and type (Borich, 1979,

p. 84). McCormick (1979) found that effective elementary teachers in Delaware (grades 1-4) understood the content (structure and substance) being taught. They were able to develop appropriate objectives, knew how to reach these objectives, and were better prepared (in terms of content). Those effective teachers better understood the unique needs of their children and taught at a level appropriate to the children. They also knew and implemented approaches and strategies based on learning, created a concern for learning, used practice, encouraged students, and so on.

Brophy (1979) found that teachers do make a difference in the classroom and that certain teachers are more effective than others. Generic teaching skills (the base for many teacher education programs) are hard to isolate and identify--what is effective in one situation may not be effective in another. Time-on-task for students, as well as for teachers, is very important in the production of learning. Well planned classroom time is crucial; more time should be spent on productive activities with less time on transitional activities that could generate confusion and possible classroom management problems. "Direct instruction" by the teacher, as opposed to peer instruction and self-instruction, contributes to learning. Working with whole classes (particularly in the upper elementary grades) is important. In the lower grades, small group instruction is effective. Being businesslike in task orientation contributes to effective instruction. That is, students and teacher focus on the lesson, students are actively involved in the lesson--whether at the board or at their seats. The teacher monitors progress and provides immediate feedback. The pace is continual, but geared to the needs and abilities of the students. As in mastery teaching or programmed instruc-

tion, moving from one objective to another involves steps that can be mastered easily. Teaching in the early grades requires more: small group instruction, teacher circulation in the classroom, individualized instruction and attention, recitation and drill, praise and effective teacher behavior, and lower cognitive level activities.

The results found by Medley (1977) reinforce those stated by Brophy: effective teachers require more time-on-task by their students than the less effective teachers; effective teachers spend more time with large group instruction and less time on seatwork and independent small group instruction; when there is independent work, the effective teacher is there supervising the students and helping those who need help: they (more effective teachers) ask lower-level questions and reduce student initiative; interaction in the classroom is not complex; effective teachers maintain a supportive environment with little student disruption; their classrooms do not reflect a negative atmosphere.

In a study of a Georgia county school system, Coker, Medley, and Soar (1980, p. 134) found that certain specific teacher behaviors were related to achievement and self-concept gains, while others were not. (Some of the negative behaviors are often encouraged in teacher pre- and in-service education programs.) Several of the behaviors positively related to achievement were selecting appropriate goals and objectives, involving students in organizing and planning, giving clear and explicit directions, having proper listening skills (listen to students), respecting the rights of others to speak, and maintaining self-control at all times. Those negatively related to achievement were pausing, eliciting, and responding to student questions; using nonverbal communication; providing teacher contact when students are not on task; allowing

students to have a voice in decision making; and using praise and/or rewards. Use of student feedback to change teaching strategies was negatively related at the elementary level and positively related at the high school level. One-to-one counseling was posivitely related with elementary mathematics but negatively with elementary language arts. It was interesting to note that some of the behaviors related (either positively or negatively) to achievement gain were related to gain in self-concept. Those behaviors that produced gain in self-concept were use of student feedback to alter teaching strategies, expectation of self-control, use of praise and/or rewards, acceptance and incorporation of student ideas, and use of one-to-one counseling. The behaviors that produced negative self-concept development were use of a variety of methods, use of proper listening skills, use of nonverbal communication, provision of teacher contact when students are not on task, and presentation of supportive classroom management. Appropriate goals are negatively related to gain in self-concept in intermediate grades and positively related in primary grades.

It is apparent that the Coker, Medley, and Soar study raises more issues than it settles, or confirms, while challenging what has been commonly accepted by the profession. For example, Morgan (1979), in a study of effective teaching in New York City high schools, found that there is an interaction between curriculum and teaching behaviors. Teachers who are active and give directions to students are more effective and provide an environment for students to become involved in purposeful learning. He also found that the high school curriculum should be "open" (have more diversity), but that without active teacher direction students become purposeless under an open curriculum. Yet

Palladino (1979) found that effective social-studies teachers in New York City use an indirect teaching style (that is, they use indirect verbal interaction, accept feelings, praise or encourage, accept student ideas, use both open questions and closed questions, and respond to student questions in a manner similar to the indirect verbal interaction found in middle-class homes). Morgan's suggestions and Palladino's findings illustrate differences in the literature, concerning what "is" and what "should be."

Marjorie Powell (1979) and Fisher, Marliave, and Filby (1979), reporting the findings of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (over a six-year period involving several hundred elementary teachers in California), found that student-attention-to- and time-on-task, consideration of student success rate, specific content covered, academic focus (learning is valued and is important to the student), and a cooperative classroom environment all contribute to effective teaching. A primary finding of the study is that "academic learning time" will improve student achievement, and that staff development should be designed to improve teachers' skills in expanding academic learning time (allocated time, student engagement, student success rate) in the classroom.

More specifically, Gage (1977, 1978) culled the following suggestions from his research on the scientific base of teaching:

1. Teachers should have a system of rules that allows students to attend to personal and procedural needs without checking with the teacher.

2. Teachers should move around the room and be aware of the needs of individual students.

3. Independent assignments should be interesting, worthwhile, and completed without teacher direction.

4. Daily class schedules should be placed on the board so that students are given specific directions. This reduces the

need for extensive direction giving.

5. Teachers should call on a student by name before asking a question. Questions should be distributed, such that students are given equal opportunity to respond.

6. Less able students should be encouraged to answer questions; therefore, questioning techniques should be adjusted to their needs.

Adkins (1979), in reviewing Gage's research listed nine general statements for teachers: (1) the specific base of teaching should be supplemented by what teachers know of the art of teaching; (2) teachers should experiment with things they do not do well; (3) teachers should solicit opinions and ideas from students and encourage student participation; (4) achievement and attitudes should be concerns of teachers; (5) "open" and "innovative" models of instructional organization do not produce the level of achievement that formal (non-punitive) procedure do; (6) teachers should not be fearful of being critical (but infrequently) of academically oriented students and of high SES students; (7) maximum time-on-task for students should be provided; (8) experimentation (exploration, creativity, self-direction, games) should not be taken form time-on-task; (9) clarity, enthusiasm, and vividness should be encouraged in teachers.

Brophy (1982, pp. 527-530) of the Michigan State University Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT) reviewed the large scale National Institute of Education and Follow Through Studies of the 1970's and found that teachers do impact on students and that there are eight teacher characteristics (or behaviors) that relate to student outcomes: characteristics of effective urban teachers. They are: (1) teacher expectations, role definitions, and sense of efficacy are well defined, are congruent with each other, and are accepted by the teacher; (2) students

are given the time to learn; (3) classroom management and organization is efficient and directed to the task of learning; (4) curriculum for each student is a match between achievement and levels of difficulty--that is, students have a high degree of success (or mastery), move rapidly, but move in small steps; (5) teachers are actively engaged in teaching--they are not just managers of instruction; (6) teachers teach to mastery, particularly lower-level objectives; (7) teachers distinguish among grade levels, that is, teachers teach children at lower grades differently and use different instructional modes than at the upper grade levels; and (8) teachers develop a friendly learning environment without decreasing a strong academic thrust.

It becomes apparent that effective urban teachers have several classroom characteristics in common. The most notable is their emphasis on time-on-task, not only for their students, but for themselves. Students are given time to learn, are expected to learn; instructional modes are used to facilitate learning; teachers are active in the teaching/learning process; what is to be learned is the next logical step in the learning sequence; and students move from one mastery level to another. Allied to time-on-task is control. Effective teachers have well planned classrooms that focus on learning and enable teachers to have control. Each student is in a directed task, but each task reflects an understanding on the part of the teacher of appropriate learning and instructional principles appropriate for the student. Effective teachers provide constructive feedback to students. The feedback is to facilitate learning; it is clear, directed to learning, and non-punitive. Finally, effective teachers know when it is appropriate to use a particular teaching

strategy--one that fits a particular grade level or group of students. For example, one group of students will react more positively to affective teaching than another. Or individual (or small group) instruction may be more effective and efficient for one group or grade level of students than for another. The above general characteristics have been culled from research that includes student outcome as part of the criteria measures. Thus more confidence can be placed in the results of such research than can be placed on results from studies that deal only with perceptions. These are clearly important instructional characteristics of effective urban teachers, and they should be an important part, if not the base, of pre- and in-service teacher education programs.

B. The Effective School

Teachers do not operate in isolation; they are part of an organization in a particular building that is called a school. There are urban schools that are considered effective (in producing learning) and there are urban schools that are considered to be ineffectual. Just what makes an effective school is still being studied; however, the research indicates that strong school building leadership and a positive school learning climate are two very important factors in establishing and maintaining an effective school (Brookover, 1979; Centra and Potter, 1980; Edmonds, 1979; Miller, 1982; Weber, 1971; Wynne, 1980).

Leadership. There is no question that in most schools the building principal sets the educational tone of the school. Thus the principal is crucial to effective schools. Principals can be effective leaders by recognizing their power and influence and by emphasizing achievement throughout the school, working with teachers in developing instruc-

tional strategies, ensuring a positive school climate that will encourage learning, monitoring student progress, being aware of the curricula in all grades, relating goals, objectives, and materials to the curricula, and supporting teachers (Sweeney, 1982).

Ronal Edmonds (1979) reviewed over 17 research studies; Edmonds and Frederiksen (1978) looked at specific urban schools; and Gilbert Austin (1979) surveyed 23 studies dealing with exemplary schools. They found that the effective school has a strong principal who exerts positive and creative leadership--leadership that brings the school together. There is high expectation of achievement for students and teachers in the effective school. The effective school is orderly but not rigid. Students are expected to learn and acquire basic skills. Teachers are also encouraged to try new approaches. Student progress is constantly monitored--with considerable reliance on teacher-made tests and teacher judgement. There is greater local control over curriculum, program, and staff. Students, teachers, and the administration feel that they have some control over their own destinies. The more effective school establishes a satisfactory home-school relationship with parents.

Similar results are reported by Wynne (1980) and Clark (1980). In addition, Wynne found a high level of communication existing in effective schools. Effective schools had high morale, stable staffs, clearly established and written rules and policies (for teachers, for students, and for student expectations), a safe environment, a high level of trust between teachers, students, and parents, and high levels of contact among all three groups. Clark also found emphasis on staff development and in-service education in effective urban schools.

The Weber study (1971) of four high achieving urban schools indica-

cated that each school had a strong leader who took the leadership role with the beginning reading program. This carried over into a continued emphasis on reading. In accord with Lezotte's (1980) findings these schools had high student expectations and an orderly learning climate. Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) cite the New York Study of 1974 that was conducted by the Office of Education Performance Review. Two Manhattan elementary schools were examined--one high and one low in achievement. Again a strong principal, open communication, positive learning environment, and an emphasis on a coherent reading program contributed to the success in the high achieving school.

It is evident that a strong building principal is important to an effective school. The principal must not only be strong and active, but he/she must be sensitive to the needs of the students and the teachers and be willing to set expectations for both. The principal must be interested in and concerned about children, teachers, the school, cognitive achievement, and positive attitude development. In addition, it is crucial that the principal, along with students and teachers, develop a positive school learning climate.

School Learning Climate. School learning climate, as defined by Brookover et al. (1982, p. 2), includes "any aspect of the school social system that is associated with the level of student learning." This inclusive definition is important because it focuses on student learning and the facilitation of that learning (parental support, school discipline, classroom management, instruction, school organization, and so on, as they affect student learning and achievement).

School learning climate as it relates to student achievement in urban communities has been the subject of much study by Brookover and others

(Brookover, 1977, 1979; Lezotte, 1980). They identified specific factors necessary to effect an improved school learning climate. The identification and communication of the goals and objectives of the specific school is a factor. Effective schools recognize that all students have the potential to learn and have adapted their instructional program to reflect this. Frequent communication among staff to plan and evaluate instruction is another important component. This would corroborate the concerns regarding communication in general, as expressed by Watson (1979). Lezotte (1980) cites adoption of the Bloom mastery paradigm as a reflection of the factors necessary for an improved learning climate (that is, define objectives, create time line, instruct, practice, administer formative testing, reinstruct and provide enrichment, and administer summative evaluation). As indicated in the previous section, the principal is the instructional leader. It is his/her charge to coordinate the mastery learning model, to encourage and support the process, and recognize and reward good teaching. Finally, a support staff to aid teacher instruction provides a valuable boost to improved learning climate.

Lezotte (1980) finds that effective teachers in schools with improved school-wide learning climates have some characteristics in common: (1) their expectation for student achievement is closely related to their expectation for their own success with the task; (2) these teachers have organized their classrooms into a positive learning environment; and (3) mastery learning is an integral part of their curricula.

In summarizing the more specific findings of research on school learning to date, Miller (1982a) divides the findings into three major categories: (1) the ideology (beliefs) of the schools for teachers and

students; (2) the organizational structure; and (3) effective instruction. Effective-school research indicates that teacher ideology includes the following: all students can learn; teachers communicate to everyone expectations that all student can learn; belief that teaching can make a difference; improving test scores are appropriate goals for schools and individual student; everyone is committed to teaching and learning; and there are high professional norms. Student ideology in effective schools includes the following: learning and achieving are important and there is pressure for achievement; there is a high self-concept of one's ability; and learning makes a difference to the individual. Role definition for teachers, principals, and students is a part of the organizational structure of effective schools. The roles are defined in terms of academic achievement, for example, effective teachers get all students to achieve. The reward system (centered on the attainment of achievement), less grouping or stratification in schools and classrooms, grade level as the minimum goal of achievement for all students, and parental support at school and home that focuses on achievement are all part of the organizational structure of the effective school according to Miller. Instruction that contributes to effective schools focuses on achievement as its major goal and is found in an orderly, work-oriented school. Direct instruction or mastery learning are important instructional delivery systems. Also, the use of time-on-task, academic teams-learning games (modeled after sport competition), effective reinforcement practices, and the use of assessment data to improve schools are part of effective instruction in effective schools.

The studies reported here indicate that although effective schools

have at least two factors in common (strong leadership, positive school learning climate), no one single factor contributes exclusively to school effectiveness. A combination of factors all interrelated, contribute to making an effective school. One strand that does appear to exist in all effective-schools research, either explicitly or implicitly, is commitment: commitment to learning, teaching, and the students on the part of the professional staff (teachers, administrators) at the school building level. As stated by Ornstein and Levine (1981), school influences student performance and this influence can be changed (positively) through indiviudal school efforts.

C. Summation

This section reviewed the current literature focusing on teacher and school effectiveness factors as they relate to higher student achievement levels. Starting with the process-product research of the last decade, research was examined in an effort to cull those teaching behaviors that appeared most likely to effect positive change. Teacher clarity of instruction, time-on-task, well planned classrooms, active teaching, teaching to mastery, adjusting the curricula, and teacher knowledge of appropriate goals and objectives and how to reach them, are but a few of the teacher effectiveness factors that were reported across studies.

Attention was focused on the effective-school literature. One factor contributing to an effective urban school seems to be strong positive educational leadership. Other criteria include stable staff, high morale, high expectations, clear cut rules, and a high level of trust and the development of a positive school learning climate. It is

apparent from the studies and research that multiple interactive factors contribute to making an urban school effective.

The one major conclusion that can be derived from all the literature in Section II is that urban teachers and schools can be effective and can make a difference. This a lesson that must not be lost to teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and of course those who have lost faith in education in urban areas.

III. The State-of-the-Art: Pre-Service Education Programs for the Urban Community

A. Overview

Pre-service teacher education programs that educate and train teachers in the 1980's for the 1960's will produce teachers who will be woefully out-of-step with the needs of the children, the schools, and the communities. This can only further the distance between schools and their communities. Although addressing the problems of in-service education, Burrello and Orbaugh's (1982) warning that there is a disparity between what is being done and what research is telling us can be done is appropriate for pre-service education as well. This dictum is further supported by Medley (1978, p. 20) who states that "Teacher Educators should adopt as primary goals the development of competencies needed (1) to create and maintain the learning environment, (2) to help pupils in learning related materials, (3) to implement the kind of instruction which the research indicates effective teachers provide." Effective teachers have several common behavioral characteristics, and these characteristics have been identified in the research literature (see Section II of this monograph). Thus, pre-service education programs should

develop teachers who care about the students, explain materials in a thorough and interesting manner, help students toward mastery, build positive relations with children, provide learning time, exhibit trust, are concerned less with punishment, and know a variety of instructional modes and techniques (Brett, 1979; Hampton, 1980; Sizemore, 1981). These and other traits should be incorporated into teacher education, regardless of model or type of design.

Coupled with a focus on individual teacher traits must be an emphasis on the urban community and the urban school. To do this, pre-service teacher education must be exposed to a variety of courses and experiences that address urban concerns. Courses such as: Multicultural Education (University of California, San Diego), The City as a Cultural Lab (University of Colorado at Denver), Problems of Urban Education (Georgia State University), Social Science in Inner City (Jersey City State College), and Community Problems (Temple University) are examples of offerings found in pre-service education programs that take pre-service teacher education students into the reality of the urban community and the urban school while dealing with education from the past to the present.

A major component of today's pre-service teacher education is the extensive use of urban-based field experiences. A significant force in the development of field experiences in urban education programs has been Teacher Corps. The Teacher Corps model was initiated to prepare teachers for urban schools through a two year teaching internship, serve low-income areas, encourage change in teacher education institutions (universities and colleges), emphasize team teaching, foster individualization of instruction, develop competency-based education, and serve

the nation's schools (Boutwell, 1966; Conner, 1967; Pisaro, 1966; Steffensen, 1975; Wegher, 1976). Teacher Corps grew out of President Johnson's "War on Poverty," although it was enacted as Title V-BI of the Higher Education Act in 1965, hence its concern with low-income families. It should be noted that Teacher Corps was never exclusively urban oriented; in fact in 1969 amendments were passed to the Education Professions Development Act (that had housed Teacher Corps legislation since 1967) allowing projects to serve juvenile delinquents and youth and adult offenders (Wegher, 1976). Still, Teacher Corps has had a major influence on urban teacher preparation through its field-based emphasis, while providing Teacher Corps interns the opportunity to earn a degree and a teaching certificate. Teacher Corps demonstrated through its projects that there is more than one viable approach to teacher education, and that early extensive field experiences are hallmarks of effective teacher education programs (Collins, 1978; Marsh, 1979; Wegher, 1976). (In 1974, Congress broadened the charge of Teacher Corps to include the retraining of experienced education personnel. Consequently, Teacher Corps moved quickly into in-service education, with only a minor commitment to preservice education. Furthermore, it should be noted that Teacher Corps funding no longer comes directly from Washington. In 1981 one funding was placed in the block grants given to the States. Funding for specific Teacher Corps projects is now an option left to the States and local school districts.)

Today, the importance of field experiences is widely recognized by many educators (Ishler and Kay, 1981; Stevens, 1982). Field-based experiences are broader than the traditional student teaching, required of all for teacher certification, and frequently start early in the pre-

service program. Field experiences cover a wide range of in-school activities for the pre-service college student, for example, observing the classroom, individual tutoring, functioning as a teacher aide at times, attending teachers' meetings, teaching mini-lessons, and other activities aimed toward a better understanding of the urban school and classroom.

A broad survey by Ishler and Kay (1981) gives some insight into the specific use of the field-based experiences. Two hundred and forty institutions of higher learning responded to this national survey. Ninety-nine percent of those responding indicated a field-based pre-student teaching experience. While 16% of the responding institutions were in cities of 500,000 or less, urban sites were used by 70% of the institutions on an average of 53% of the time. The most frequently reported field-based activities were observation of instruction - 99%; tutoring - 98%; reporting back to institutions of higher learning - 95%; performing non-instructional tasks - 91%; operating media - 86%; planning instruction - 84%; designing instructional material -82% (Ishler and Kay, 1981, p. 17).

As previously stated, field-based experiences are usually started early in a student's program, often in the freshman or sophomore year, and tend to be more than a single experience. It is not uncommon for programs to mandate 100 or more clock hours of experiences out in the field before student teaching. For example, the State of Kentucky will require a minimum of 150 clock hours of clinical and field experiences in all secondary education preparatory programs starting in 1983. Field experiences are an important and valuable segment of teacher preparatory programs.

Gehrke (1981) offers the following rationale for field-based training:

1. The opportunity to learn the realities of teaching is enhanced. It puts learning in a proper context.

2. Students become more involved in the effects of their efforts in a real, rather than simulated, situation. Field-based training acts as a motivator in this capacity.

3. Career choice and commitment is facilitated. Students can test whether they want to teach.

4. It is economically more feasible as a training ground than a "lab school" situation.

5. Additional human labor is provided in the schools and the classroom to meet community needs.

6. It provides an academically stimulating situation for both the general practitioner and the theoretician. The professor of education is exposed to the current activities of the classroom. This should provide a more realistic base of instruction at the university. Being in the field could provide the professor an opportunity to generate new knowledges through field-based research.

Although not stated by Gehrke, another value of having professors of education out in the field monitoring their students is the possible cross-pollenization of ideas and methodologies between classroom teachers and the professors. This has an important in-service function for classroom teachers. The "State-of-the-Art" can be brought into the classroom in a subtle, if not unobtrusive, manner.

The selection of appropriate and varied field experience placement has been recognized by teacher educators. Horak (1981) suggests that the amount of time that a teacher preparation student spends in the field may not be the only factor influencing his/her behavior and attitude. The mode or the type of classroom experience is also a factor. For example, it was found that pre-service students in self-contained classrooms preferred a more structured than unstructured curriculum; this was particu-

larly true in science teaching. Horak emphasizes the need for field experience to be different and varied. Fisher (1980) states that student attitudes toward teaching can be improved by placement with a supervising teacher trained in generic teaching skills and the use of feedback procedures.

Early placement and the amount of time spent in the field are important elements in a field-based program; however, planning and administration, type of placement experiences, and the interacting school personnel are important considerations that make major contributions to the development of the type of teacher entering the profession (Mendoza and Webb, 1981; Wilson, 1979). In general, learning is facilitated when one starts at the concrete level with the contextual experience, learns the theoretical and conceptual rationale, and is able to apply both on the independent level (in the field). It is evident that field experiences, and not just student teaching is a major part of most urban teacher education programs. There is a wide commitment to field experiences in programs that prepare teachers for urban schools. This commitment is found in the models and types of pre-service urban teacher preparation programs described below.

B. Selected Innovations and Programs

During the first half of the seventies, many universities and colleges embarked on programs to improve their pre-service education for the inner-city. Most included field-based programs planned jointly with the involved school district. The following are selected examples of programs that were developed.

The Brandom University-Winnipeg, Canada (Winnipeg, 1973) program

gave the option of one additional year to allow students to spend 50% of their 60 credit hours in student teaching (each student teacher had to be at least 21 years of age) in culturally diverse schools in the Winnipeg School System. Brandom actively recruited inner-city minority residents in an attempt to break down existing community-school barriers and to bring more minorities into the teaching profession. Most of the recruited minorities were Canadian Indians; they received a training allowance similar to that paid by the Canadian Manpower System. The program was developed through heavy consultation with the Winnipeg School Division (school system).

North Texas State University and the Dallas Schools (Simms, et al., 1975) developed a program that merged didactic instruction and clinical practice in a professional semester. The program includes a field-based CBTE professional semester in three of Dallas' inner city schools, to reduce the gap between theory and practice, give pre-service teachers exposure to urban school teaching and related community agencies, and improve teacher education by involving in-service teachers as part of the teacher education team. Although public school personnel participate fully, funding came from the regular college budget. All successful student teachers receive positions in the Dallas system. It is important to note that this program is now an ongoing option in the university's teacher education plan.

A program specifically designed to prepare students for inner-city teaching of the mildly retarded, learning disabled, behaviorally disordered, and children in the regular classroom was established by Bowling Green State University (Elsass, 1978). Students could exit the program armed with triple certification. Seniors, who have completed all other

requirements, spend six weeks on campus in a concentrated course of Special Education methodology. The next five weeks are spent in Toledo agencies working with urban youth. They move from this into three, seven-week student teaching assignments (one for each area of certification). This program is unique for several reasons: it involves a full year of study; the emphasis is on behavioral disorders; an agency component is included; and the student teaching situations are very challenging. Staff involvement includes faculty, graduate students, and agency personnel. Recommendations resulting from the project speak to the following: total commitment by the university staff, careful evaluation by the staff, establishment of strong rapport with the college seniors, and the importance of volunteer status for the more difficult placements.

Indiana University at Bloomington has a cultural immersion field experience option composed of an American Indian Reservation Project, a Latino Project, an Urban Project, and an Overseas Project (Mahan, 1980). The urban project stresses direct involvement with inner-city Blacks in an effort to help them help themselves. From 1972-80, only 10% of the education majors opted for any of the alternatives. Those who got involved tended to be more socially and politically active students. Non-participants were seen as not being risk-takers. They were unwilling to live and/or work in a non-middle-class environment, and many stated that their parents discouraged the involvement.

An innovative, performance based, interdisciplinary program in elementary and secondary education was piloted at the University of Toledo (Dickson et al., 1972). The program, as stated, was performance based. Ojbectives were specified in behavioral terms with clearly defined evaluative criteria. The teams of instructors involved with the program repre-

sented a variety of disciplines. Their goal was to unite urban education institutions (schools, colleges of education) with other facets of the urban community. The University worked closely with the Toledo Public Schools and many community agencies. The program which was based on the Ohio Model Teacher Education Design, was funded through the College of Education and the Sears Roebuck Foundation. Modularized objectives were developed and sequenced into either four elementary or two secondary sequences--they replaced the traditional "courses." All education students were required to participate in the program. Results of the program were positive. Team teaching, close school-community relations, management strategies, and change strategies all developed in the project.

In the 1972, ten juniors, recruited for their potential to work in the inner city, were selected for a pilot project conducted by Gary (Indiana) Public Schools and Moorhead State College (DiPasquale, 1972). After a three week campus-based orientation program, students were moved to integrated apartment complexes in the inner city to begin their total immersion program. Students functioned first as teacher aides; gradually, they assumed more independent responsibility. Outside community involvement was built into the project, as well. Ongoing seminars involving academicians and practitioners from both the college and school system completed the plan. The project was declared a success based upon student self-appraisal, project evaluation by school personnel, and student competency as determined by the cooperating teachers. Although no statistical information is available, the following recommendations emerged from the project evaluation:

1. There should be integration of field-based experience, theo-

retical pedagogy, and community involvement.

2. Two courses should precede the extensive internship--an orientation course that includes some practical experience and a field experience course that exposes students to diverse cultural groups.
3. Living with the community being served is valuable.

In the early 1970's, the State University of New York at Buffalo and the Buffalo City Schools cooperatively developed a Center for Pre-Service Education to integrate theory and practice in broad-based field experiences (King and Mycio, 1975). Students not only observed and participated in five cooperating middle and high schools, but they observed other schools for contrast. The students examined the sociological base of education and developed ethnographic skills. They received a macroview of teaching through their experiences in the program.

It is apparent that the preceding innovations piloted within traditional teacher education contain components that are now routine in programs preparing teachers for urban schools: broad field experiences, working closely with urban schools, focusing on important target groups. Strong field-based programs are found in the following programs: University of Alabama in Birmingham; University of California, San Diego; Duquesne University; Jersey City State College; University of Louisville; Teachers College, Columbia University; Temple University; and the University of Toledo. In addition, there are strong bilingual programs at the University of California, San Diego; University of Colorado at Denver; Teachers College, Columbia University; and Temple University. While Hamline University targets Native Americans in the Twin Cities (MN) area, Rockhurst College, through the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education pro-

gram (CUTE), provides an inner-city experience in Kansas City for students primarily from the midwest who might not be exposed to such an experience.

IV. The State-of-the-Art: In-Service Education for the Urban Community

A. Definition

In-service teacher education, also known as staff development, has become a crucial component of the urban schools. Because in-service education programs are designed for the professional development and continued education of practicing teachers, administrators, and school staff, in order to provide quality education for students (to enhance achievement), the in-service programs for urban schools should deal with problems and concerns of the urban schools. The bottom line, however, must be the translation of in-service education into teacher/administrator behaviors that will produce maximum learning in an effective school that is staffed by effective teachers.

A conceptual definition of in-service education would include all theoretical and practical activities that occur after a person is certified. Since in-service education occurs after initial certification, participation is, to some degree, an option open to the individual's discretion. Participation may be built into some collective bargaining contracts, mandated by state departments of education through requirements to make teaching certificates permanent and/or encouraged through monetary incentive (deficit model, McLaughlin and Berman, 1977; Hutson, 1981), encouraged through released time (developmental model), or a function of professional and/or personal need on the part of the teacher. Individuals participate for a variety of reasons and factors.

Graduate programs and graduate offerings may have an in-service thrust. Although there may be a degree or an additional certificate awarded, this does not preclude these offerings from being considered as in-service programs. Many colleges/universities offer a special series of workshops or courses designed specifically to meet in-service needs (they may or may not be taken for credit). These are called "university-based" in-service programs. Series of courses on classroom management and micro-computers are examples of such programming. It is not uncommon for institutions of higher education to work closely with school districts in an in-service mode, to provide in-service support or expertise (Boston, Chicago, Columbus, OH, Los Angeles, New York City, Philadelphia, Richland County, SC), and work closely with one or more colleges or universities in providing in-service options for their professional staff. However, there can be a difference between traditional degree programs and in-service education. Elfenbein (1978) explains in-service education through a comparison of the concept with traditional graduate education. The latter tends to be theoretical, be less practical, require higher thought processes, involve more outside work, and be more challenging. Conversely, in-service education is more job related, more practical and useful, and more teacher sensitive.

B. Needs and Goals

There is no question that we are in the midst of an education recession. A direct result of this has been described as the "Graying of America's Teachers" (see Section I of this monograph). In 1975, the median age of all teachers was 33. Elementary teachers had an average of 7.4 years of experience; high school teachers averaged 8 years in the

profession (Elfenbein, 1978). This is much different from the average 3 years in the profession in the 1950's and 60's. Some form of continuing education becomes mandatory if we are to continue to infuse the profession with new and productive ideas and techniques.

Along with the non-growth and aging teacher population is the very changing urban society, with its changing demands on the urban schools (refer to Section I). Consequently, urban school programs have not stayed static--new programs are being introduced and old ones are being revised in order to improve the academic achievement of children in urban schools (Levine, 1982).

The Urban Education Studies, begun in 1977 under the direction of Frances S. Chase, investigated programs in major urban areas across the country (Walter, 1981). It was concluded that urban areas have embarked on new school programs that must necessitate new role expectations for teachers and consequently more in-service training. New York, Denver, and Dade County use a lot of community interaction in their programs. Dallas and Philadelphia involve business and industry. Basic life skills are nor a part of the curricula of New York, Denver, and Indianapolis. The Chicago Mastery Approach is another example of innovative programming for which pre-service education has not prepared the teachers adequately. (It is interesting to note that the effective programs in our major cities have some common core elements: (1) strong, risk-taking leaders; (2) more local autonomy where instructional practice is concerned; and (3) school-based management that can adapt to change in its own way.)

Schurr and Sciara surveyed a sample of teachers to determine in-service needs (1977). A 61 item instrument was used. Results were factor analyzed; 12 factors emerged. Those receiving highest priority were

in-service programs focusing on Behavior Problem Management and Individualized Instruction (N=2266). The second highest areas were Structured Instruction and General Methodology. Evaluation, testing, and cultural plurality topics received the lowest priorities. Yet, however, others see in-service as a means to solve problems, provide remedial help to teachers, provide motivation and upward mobility, and as a means of retaining one's position in a system (Florio and Koff, 1977).

The retaining of one's position in a system has become more significant because of the reductions-in-force (see Section I) facing many urban schools and, for those who are hired, the changing of certification requirements in many states. Teacher competence via testing and observation prior to certification is a part of many state programs (NAEP Newsletter, Summer, 1981). Georgia has had subject-related pencil/paper testing in place since 1978. Observation of beginning teachers in Georgia began in 1980-81. Florida requires testing prior to certification--they plan to include an observation component shortly. This observation will be completed by a peer, an outsider, and the principal. An assessment instrument delineating 14 competencies will be used. Remedial in-service will be made available. A similar model should be operational in South Carolina by July, 1982, and the State of Kentucky is seriously considering competency testing and a first year observation period prior to issuing a provisional certificate. Thus, in-service programs will have an even more important job retaining significance for some new teachers (those who have deficits).

It is interesting to note that Howey believes that the quality of in-service education is directly affected by pre-service education (Howey, 1977). He suggests that a transition step be built between pre-

and in-service education--that is, an internship. We would further suggest that pre-service teachers be trained to expect and use in-service continuing educaton like their counterparts in medicine and law. New teachers must be aware that their professional education will continue to need updating through their professional careers, and that such training is crucial in environments that are in a constant flux.

Bents and Howey delineate three general goals of in-service education: enhancing adult cognition of intra- and interpersonal development which impinge upon teacher effectiveness (adult development), altering school environment to enhance effective teaching (environmental conditions), and altering instructional behaviors (pedagogical changes) (Bents and Howey, 1978). Since these goals tend to be more individual, developmental, and situational-specific in nature (as opposed to being institutional), in-service that is school based or classroom focused over a period of time would appear to be appropriate (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Carberry, Waxman and McKain, 1981; Edelfelt, 1977; Glassberg and Oja, 1981; Greenwood et al., 1975; Hipple and Christiansen, 1979; Howey, 1977; Howey, Bents, and Corrigan, 1981; Katz, 1979; Roper and Nolan, 1977).

Johnson and Sloat (1980) reported results of an in-service program offered to elementary teachers by a university. Significant increase in positive teaching behaviors, coupled with a decrease in negative behavior, was observed at the conclusion of the in-service. Follow-up surveys conducted five and twelve months later indicated that the changes were not maintained. It would appear that there is a need for more individualized training to be conducted over a long period of time. Carney corroborates this as it relates to the urban scene (1979). In addition, he indicates

that in-service programs are better received by urban teachers when they move from the general to the specifics of the individual building and class.

Notwithstanding school district and school building needs, it is important that in-service recognizes the importance of the individual teacher. Each person's needs are important to him/herself, and it is at that point of reference that the in-service programs should be developed. Dale Mann (1975, p. 22) summarized this issue so precisely, when he stated "...virtually every teacher and every educational administrator believes their situation is literally unique and thus feel themselves justified in ignoring any advice or any reform not consciously tailored to their particular situation. Staff development efforts, being pointed at individuals help to break through that resistance."

Yet school districts, who generally fund in-service education, must consider school building and district-wide needs in their in-service programs. Consequently, it is quite common to see fully developed in-service programs focusing on district-wide and/or building concerns. District-wide and bulding-wide in-service programs are the mode, where there are district funded, or supported, programs. Thus, the accommodation of individual needs must be built into such programs. This can be done by being sensitive to individual teacher needs (through needs assessment), having teachers help plan in-service programs, using teachers and outside experts as resources, holding programs at times convenient to teachers, providing incentives for the individual, individualizing instruction as much as possible, and using effective learning and instructional techniques. Above all, it must be recognized that teachers are adults with unique concerns, interests, and limitations; they

are not like the children they teach (Andrews, Houston, and Bryant, 1981).

Teacher education differs from traditional adult programs in a variety of ways. Learning in in-service tends to be more contextual, specific, and application oriented. Howey (1981, p. 15) has identified five factors that make teacher education different from other adult education. They are: (1) often in-service is required study--impossibly by local or state mandate; (2) a teacher is expected to master content and to immediately demonstrate learning; (3) learning may not be self-enriching--the end goal of what teachers learn is to implement learning in others; (4) information learned is situation specific (teachers work in schools and all information relates to that context); and finally (5) teachers will be evaluated by how well their students perform. These five points provide a great deal of insight into the area of teacher in-service and how it differs from traditional adult education situations and expectations.

Elfenbein takes into account the above issues, concerns, needs, and goals in her listing of twelve factors that contribute to effective and meaningful in-service (1978, pp.22-23):

1. It should be part of the total school program and as such should occur on-site during the work day. [author's note: Howey, Bents and Corrigan (1981, p. 7) reports a study of Yarger, Howey, and Joyce in which less than 20% of teachers surveyed reported other than after-school courses or workshops.]
2. It should have a definite identity with a budget and full time staff.
3. It should be well-organized with a governing unit.
4. It should identify with school needs.

5. Those taking the in-service should be involved with the planning. [author's note: In many urban communities the teachers' unions are strong and are actively involved in developing in-service programs for their members. It would be reasonable for school districts and the unions to cooperatively develop such whether they be district-wide or school-based.]

6. There should be diverse and flexible offerings.

7. No charge should be involved--some credit toward salary or certification should be included.

8. An evaluation of its effectiveness is ncessary (especially as it relates to the classroom).

9. "Action Research" should be ongoing.

10. A dissemination policy should be in place.

11. Staffing should be as expert as possible.

12. The emphasis should be on staff development at the bulding level.

C. History

In-service programs are not new. Many urban school districts had extensive in-service programs in the 1940's and early 50's. Often these were discrete courses, usually one or two sessions long, that focused on a particular program area--for example, "Art in the Classroom," "How to Teach Fractions," and so on. By the 1950's in-service programs were either supplemented, or totally replaced, by advanced graduate programs (M. Ed., M.A., and so on). Such degree programs were encouraged by changes in salary scales and/or requirements for permanent state certification. As previously indicated, many Master of Education degree programs now offered in our colleges and universities are structured and designed to have significant in-service application.

The federal government encouraged in-service education in the late

1950's and 1960's through such programs as NDEA, NSF, and EPDA grants and funding. These grants were used by individuals for further training and in some cases retraining. Funding from NSF and NDEA were used to develop major curricula (SMSG, BSCS, CHEM Study, and so on) as well. The thrusts of such programs were general (as opposed to focusing on classroom problems in specific situations) and were designed to meet the needs of schools as determined by individuals from outside the schools (for example, federal agencies, state departments of education, universities or colleges). The major problems with both the degree programs and the 1950-1960's approach were: (1) although individual teachers tended to benefit, the real needs and concerns of the classroom (and school) were not always addressed by the new teaching skills acquired, and (2) the broad curricula changes affected a few selected children. Since these funding programs did not focus on school problems per se, their effectiveness tended to be restricted.

Urban schools, the type of children in such schools, and the urban society as a whole have changed drastically since the 1950's and early 1960's. A a result, the federal government by policy and law reduced funding and programs that focused on the individual teacher (the type described in the previous paragraph) and on specific curricular renovations. Instead the government encouraged the development of thrusts that were school-based or district-wide (for example, Teacher Centers, Teacher Corps) and were heavily influenced by classroom needs (Dumais et al., 1980).

As the demand for new urban teachers declined in the early 1970's, Teacher Corps recognized the need to shift emphasis from training new personnel (interns) for the classroom to providing in-service programs.

In 1974, Congress broadened the charge of Teacher Corps to include the retraining of experienced educational personnel. An ever-increasing shift toward in-service education continued; today Teacher Corps projects are heavily in-service in design, structure, and thrust (Edelfelt, 1977; Hord and Rutherford, 1980; Olivarez, 1980; Sarment, 1981; Teacher Corps Reports, undated). The pre-service thrust of Teacher Corps is limited to four interns per project.

A Teacher Corps in-service project in Arlington, Virginia, in 1976-77 was one of their earlier in-service models (Wittes and Cooper, 1977). Problems that emerged from the project concerned time and money, scheduling, teacher apathy, lack of administrative support, and some poor planning. As a result, it was concluded that much of the in-service would be handled best at the building level. In addition, a survey of elementary teachers revealed the following incentives for in-service: additional salary, a desire to work with other educational agencies, a goal of becoming a master teacher, and the opportunity to receive free and useful material. Secondary teachers were surveyed, and it was found that a sense of achievement and the challenge of reaching excellence were incentives for participating in in-service programs.

As a result of experiences in a variety of in-service projects, it became apparent that no one Teacher Corps model encompasses the best approach. Each situation is unique and requires an approach designed to meet specific differences. Generally, it was found that in-service that focuses on school and classroom problems is more meaningful to teachers, and teachers should be heavily involved in the planning in order to make the in-service relevant to them.

A Teacher Corps report from Western Washington State College

(undated) capsulized the general approaches to in-service as adopted by Teacher Corps:

1. Teachers will become involved in programs which they helped plan; outside programs will be rejected.

2. In-service planning will depend on the strengths of the planners. The quality of the in-service is a function of the planning.

3. Teachers will be more influenced by school-based in-service than courses on a campus.

4. Models of in-service can vary. Arlington, Virginia based their program upon utilization of enormous resources from the central office of the system. Western Washington developed a linkage between the local education agency and an institution of higher learning. Vermont placed the local faculty squarely in the center of in-service planning.

By the late 1970's, in-service education had become a major educational activity. This could be seen in the reorientation of Teacher Corps, the development and expansion of Teacher Centers (Edelfelt, 1982; Sparks, 1982), the organization of the National Council of States on In-service Education (Hite, 1977), and the number of individuals involved. It was estimated that by 1977, 70-80,000 professors, supervisors, and consultants, 100,000 principals and vice principals, plus nonsupervising support personnel were involved in supplying in-service programs at a considerable cost (Butler, 1978; Howey, 1977). It is clear from the review of the literature, the changing characteristics and needs of urban communities, schools and teaching staffs, and the numbers involved, that in-service education is fast becoming institutionalized in American urban education.

D. Models and Types

There are many models of in-service education. They range from the organizational to the research and conceptual. For example, Nelson

(1976) described five models of in-service education: The Higher Education Model in which an institute of higher education provides evening and week-end courses; the Contemporary Topics Institute which is usually based around a current issue--one-time-only workshops are common; Commerce Model involving consultants and entrepreneurs who offer intensive training; Institute of Higher Learning - Local Education Agency Cooperative Model which is tailored to school needs; and the Systematic Corporate Model which involves a conceptual framework, an operational design, and a support system. Yarger (1976) lists six organizational types: Independent - similar to the British model, the in-service is independent of any educational institution; Quasi-Independent - the in-service program has some formal ties with an organization; Single Unit - in-service administered by a school district; Free Partnership - this is similar to Nelson's Cooperative Model; Free Consortium - in-service structure designed and controlled by three or more institutions; and Legislative/Political - in-service that is prescribed by a legislature, state department of education, or the like. Fox (1981) breaks the Single Unit into two settings, single school (working on a local issue) and multiple school (working on district-wide concerns); he calls Teacher Centers and university programs "Ad Hoc groups." Many of the in-service programs in urban communities are either sponsored exclusively by a school district (single unit, systematic corporate models) or organized cooperatively with one or more institutions of higher education (Teacher Corps projects are examples of cooperation models). Often colleges or universities provide the expert advisors and trainer for school district in-service programs. More and more school districts are relying on outside consultants to focus their in-service programs; in a few cases these consultants become the in-service. What-

ever model is used, the in-service programs found in school districts are controlled by the districts with varying amounts of teacher input in their development and operation. Where there are strong teacher groups, there is a tendency for the teachers to have a strong (if not dominant) voice in the entire teacher in-service programs.

There are several research, conceptual, or theoretical models that can be used in in-service education. The models are based on what the programs are to accomplish or in what manner the programs function, for example, Analytic Frame-work (Bolam, 1978); Clinical Supervision Model (Goldhammer, 1969); Concerns-based Adaptation (Hall, 1975); Developmental (that is, Piaget, Kohlberg) Education (Glassberg and Oja, 1981); Social, and Personal or Information-Processing Model (Joyce and Weil, 1978). Regardless of the conceptual models, there is a commonality across all in-service programs: a governance or management structure; an instructional format(s); content, substance and concepts invovled; incentive development; often a needs assessment survey; often collaborative planning and shared governance; a developmental and maturing state for the in-service program and for participant involvement (Bents and Howey, 1978; Berman, 1975; Dumais et al., 1980; Greenwood et al., 1975; Hutson, 1981; Joyce et al., 1976).

The following Teacher Corps in-service programs illustrate the variety and scope of programs developed by Teacher Corps projects in cooperation with school systems.

An in-service program jointly conceived by Stanford Teacher Corps and Hoover Junior High in San Jose, California, is an example of the widely used cooperative model (Roper and Nolan, 1977). Eight work-study teams (language arts, mathematics, physical education, social studies,

bilingual education, multicultural education, community education, utilization of open space) were organized in a school-wide plan. Each had a faculty advisor from Stanford University. Teachers were policy makers and in-service educators. Teachers who were involved in the project were given released time to work in their area of concern.

School climate is best described as "The norms, beliefs, and attitudes reflected in institutional patterns and behavioral practices that enhance or impede student achievement" (Lezotte et al., 1980: p. 4), and in 1978 the University of Texas at El Paso (Teacher Corps Project) made the improvement of school climate its top priority. The Project worked on school climate within the Anthony Independent School District and the Canutillo Independent School District (Perez, 1980). Both populations are predominantly low-income Mexican American. They both suffer from a high turnover of teachers, and a local political scene that involved school politics--thus resulting in high teacher and administrative turnover. Traditional teacher education had failed to provide either the teachers or the administrators with appropriate skills. The project was planned to last four years. The planning process was multifaceted. Involving analysis of information about students, personnel, community resources, and the expected outcomes (using a competency-based model which anticipated improved student achievement and attitude). Baseline data was collected from a random sample of Grades 3, 5, 7, 9. Formative information was gathered in 1981 using the California Achievement Test, Texas Assessment of Basic Skills, and the Survey of School Attitude. Summative data will be collected in the fourth year of the project.

The Houston Independent School District is the fifth largest district in the United States (N=191,000). It is divided into six administrative districts. The University of Houston Teacher Corps project is located in Area VI (Buckley, 1980). Four schools (two elementary, one junior high, one senior high) were targeted for work. This project anticipated change in several areas:

1. Improved school climate--at present a clean-up campaign has been initiated at one elementary school; the junior high teachers have attended a planning retreat; 60 teachers have met to develop a cross-school Consistency Management program.

2. Improved Educational Personnel Development System--in July of 1979, 36 teachers from the four schools met to plan specific in-services--these 36 continued to meet through the year.

3. Adoption of educational improvement by other educational agencies and institutions. They hope to synthesize pre- and in-service activities into a new teacher (Project Entry) program for 30 first-year teachers.

Evaluation of the in-service indicates that approximately 80% of the in-service covered was transferred into the classroom. Those consultants who were most successful in effecting transfer used a practical approach with concrete examples and were willing to demonstrate in the classroom. A reward system also increased the value of the project--teachers received coupons for involvement which could be redeemed for material.

Other non-Teacher Corps projects cover a wide variety of in-service models and thrusts too. An interesting in-service model arose from a recognized need at Curley Junior High School in Boston, Massachusetts (Wittes and Cooper, 1977). In 1972, Curley, a heavily Spanish-speaking area, became a center of violence. In an effort to work with their students, teachers requested help with conversational Spanish. The Institute

for Learning and Teaching (University of Massachusetts-Boston) responded with a 15-week course that met at the school. This was the first step in a change-oriented plan that responded to school needs. Since 1974, Curley has been actively devoting its energies to peaceful desegregation. Many reasons for the success of the program are offered--one factor is that the degree of tension and dissatisfaction was at an optimal level to elicit readiness for change. Several other factors are worthy of note: the training program was change oriented and thus related directly to the perceived problems; participants were involved in the process at all levels; attempts were made to elicit change in individuals (skills, attitudes, behaviors), in group dynamics (leadership, division of labor, conflict resolution), and in the organization (power structure, communication process, goals); time was allowed to build a trust relationship among participants; in addition, traditional administration/faculty power imbalances were modified.

The Interactive Research and Development on Teaching (IR & DT) model, proposed in 1975 by Tikunoff and Ward, formed the base for an in-service approach used in two school districts (Tikunoff, Ward, and Griffin, 1981). This model teamed teachers, researchers, and developers/trainers to conduct research while attending to teacher needs through research findings, methodologies, and procedures. The focus was on problem solving. The strategy was implemented in a rural setting in Vermont and an urban setting in California. For purposes of this paper, we shall examine the model as it was implemented in the San Diego Unified School District (1977-78). The team was composed of four teachers, one researcher, and one trainer/developer. The team studied the following questions: "What are the strategies and techniques which classroom

teachers use to cope with distractors to classroom instruction, and how effective are these techniques?" (Tikunoff, Ward, and Griffin, 1981, p. 193). A sample of existing techniques was taken via examination of current practices in the classrooms. This was done in the Winter-Spring of 1978. Training was initiated in the Fall of the same year. This model was well received for a variety of reasons: it came with a problem-solving intent; support of various groups was apparent; there was concurrent research and development; and during the entire process, the integrity of the classroom was maintained. The participants made several recommendations as a result of the program: (1) IR & DT strategies should be an integral part of research and development at all levels since the outcomes are viewed as being more useful by the practitioners. (2) There must be careful selection and training of the team. (3) External review and assistance to the project would helpful. (4) A change in the funding policies is needed. Much current funding is appropriate for recognized problem areas. IR & DT is both an identification and solution model--a planning grant would be more beneficial to this type of in-service.

Mercer City School District in Mercer, California, constitutes approximately 600 students--60% are minority children. An I/D/E/A Project School, they approach in-service education via a clinical model (Heckman and Schmidt, 1978). They believe that teaching consists of patterns of action rather than isolated tactics. Clinical observations provide the teacher with the opportunity to analyze the quality and frequency of interaction patterns. Such observations also provide a vehicle through which teachers and administrators work together toward instructional improvement.

Bilingual programs in the State of Michigan have increased from 3 languages in 1975 to 23 in 1980 (Gianneti and Hodes, 1980). A joint project of Mercy College in Detroit and the Oak Park, Southfield, and Birmingham school districts in suburban Detroit resulted in teacher in-service that stressed language training for teachers and paraprofessionals. The community provided knowledgeable individuals to work with school and college personnel. A consortium coordinator helped facilitate the program which focused on methodology, culture, and language proficiency. Six courses, dealing with methodology and culture (25 specific competencies) were offered by the college. Another course in language proficiency had ten competencies that were extremely specific--for example, "Conduct a mini-lesson in language arts in the targeted language." In addition to community, teacher, paraprofessional, parent, and college involvement was State Department of Education invovlement. Communication with the State resulted in allowing the college to issue an additional endorsement to those certified teachers who participated in the program.

The QUEST Program (Questions to Upgrade and Encourage Student Thinking) has met with positive results (Hughes, 1981). Based on the work of Lyle and Syndette Ehrenbert, the program involves 60 hours of staff development in strategies to teach thinking skills. Teachers in Shaker Heights, Ohio, were offered the in-service. Coupled with the 60 hours of training was a minimum of four classroom visits by the trainers. Trainer observation indicated that there were increased thinking strategies employed in the classroom as a result of teacher participation in the QUEST program.

Smith and Haley (1981) described an elementary mathematics in-service project that was implemented in the Greater Phoenix Arizona area. During the summer of 1977-78 District Resource Leaders (selected math

coordinators and talented teachers) met with two math department instructors from the University of Arizona to plan the program for the next academic year. Twenty-four resource leaders and 800 teachers participated in the in-service. University credit was available. The goals of the project were to increase competency, share strategy, and introduce interesting methodologies. Evaluation was by questionnaire for teachers, while student growth was measured by the Stanford Achievement Test Math Battery, Intermediate Level I. (Grade 5 teachers and students were the only ones measures.) Results indicated that teachers rated the program as Excellent or Good (only 2 out of 127 fifth-grade teachers gave the program a rating of Poor). Students of participating teachers did significantly better on Math Computation and Math Application than did students of non-participating teachers. There was, however, no significant difference on the Math Concepts subtest.

Louisiana has just launched a Professional Improvement Program for educators (PIPS). Teachers are offered additional pay for taking part in the program (Walton, 1981). Although the program is voluntary, the approximately $2000 per year salary increase is a great incentive. This incentive will be available during and after the five-year cycle of training. Teachers who take approved academic programs will be given "Professional Improvement Points." Work can be completed via accredited colleges/universities or state department of education approved workshops. Walton reported that as of August, 1981, 32,574 teachers (80% of those eligible) had signed up for PIPS. The project is controlled at the local level. Interested teachers submit a plan to a school district committee composed of other teachers. Teacher

evaluations are considered in conjunction with the plan--the committee can accept, reject, or modify the plan based on areas of strength and/or weakness revealed by the teacher evaluation. Too new to assess, the project is receiving support and problems appear minimal.

One final urban plan is worth noting. Thomas Jefferson High School in Council Bluff, Iowa has an ongoing program that involves total faculty and administrator support (Hawkes, 1980). Discipline and a poor school atmosphere are the two major areas being attended to. The 75 individual faculty members work in four groups with three administrators and one education consultant serving as facilitators. The outcome has been the development of school-wide policies to facilitate acquisition of desired goals. Individual student contracts have been drawn as part of the procedure. Increased student pride is noticeable in the care of the building and the attitude of both students and teachers as the result of the in-service program.

Institutions of higher education are heavily involved in in-service programs, with about one half of such programs having a formal relationship with a school district(s). Most of the non-school related in-service programs are composed of individual courses, a sequenced set of courses, or a degree program.

School-based programs still appear to be a distant third behind the number of districts that offer a wide variety of in-service courses available for teachers to select on their own. Many of the districts are involved in in-service programs that were developed elsewhere (e.g. Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA), Student Team Learning Techniques).

Research and Evaluation

Evaluation over time appears to be a major weakness of in-service programs; there is little follow-up in the classroom to determine the effectiveness of the in-service programs (Bents and Howey, 1978; Florio and Koff, 1977; Howey, Bents and Corrigan, 1981). This isn't to state that all in-service programs are not evaluated; some have built into their programs extensive quantitative and/or qualitative research and evaluative procedures (Budley, 1980; Johnson and Sloat, 1980; Powell and Winecoff, 1977; Tikunoff, Ward and Griffin, 1981; Wilson and Blum, 1981).

Given what is known about the changes in urban schools over the last three decades (Section I) and effective teachers and schools (Section II), it would be reasonable to assume that in-service programs would want to determine their effectiveness through the translation of the programs into teacher classroom behaviors and interactions, and more specifically into student achievement. It is important to note Ebel's (1982, p. 375) statement, "No instructional program should be undertaken or continued in the absence of evidence of its effectiveness in producing learning." This hold true for in-service programs with relationship to student learning. The previously described El Paso (Perez, 1980) and the Greater Phoenix Arizona (Smith and Haley, 1981) projects are examples of in-service programs that included student achievement as part of their evaluation. Comparative evaluations, such as the following study of a Teacher Corps intern program, are rather scarce in the in-service literature.

In an effort to assess Teachers Corps' contribution to effective inner-city teaching, 82 sixth-cycle Teacher Corps graduates were matched with 82 non-Teacher Corps graduates (March, 1979). The instruments used

to measure effectiveness included teacher questionnaires, SIR Classrooms Observation Guide for Teacher Performance, Metropolitan Achievement Test, and the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale. Results indicate that Teacher Corps trained individuals developed more culturally relevant material, worked more with community resources and parents, had more positive attitudes toward reading development and the causes of poverty, and last, but not least, children (grades 4-6) in Teacher Corps graduates' classrooms had significantly higher self-concepts. There were some areas where no difference was found between groups, that is, in questioning techniques, teaching strategies, and reading ability.

What is even more difficult to find is comparative research on the effectiveness of different types of in-service modalities. Are released time programs more effective than after school programs? Do cooperative programs produce greater change in classrooms than do those non-cooperative in-service programs? Which teacher incentives have proven to be most effective? Which instructional techniques used in in-service programs are most effective? These are but a few of the questions that need to be answered through systematic research and evaluation.

There are many reasons for the lack of use of research and evaluation in in-service education programs; however, one major factor is the nature of in-service: job-related, practically oriented, less theoretical. Because in-service is not theoretical and is task oriented, there is a tendency to focus only on methodology and procedures without relating them to their research origins or base. Generally, the "how to" is more important than the "why" to the in-service participants, and this is unfortunate for the programs as well as for the individuals involved. The use of actual research findings, and particularly research

on classroom teaching, has been difficult to find in in-service programs (Lanier and Glassberg, 1981).

One can not assume that because a program is practical, it is effective by virtue of its practicality. The practical orientation of in-service education should not preclude the use of evaluation procedures to assess in-service effectiveness. The state of the art of evaluation (quantitative, qualitative), assessment instruments, and follow-up procedures, permits classroom, building, and school district assessment of in-service programs.

Time may be another reason for the dearth of research and/or evaluation. Since in-service programs tend to be restricted to a particular time of day, length per period of presentation (for example, three hours per week), and length of duration (one session, one semester, a school year, and so on), the use of "less important" background materials (research) may be limited by time availability. Also, such time constraints may restrict in-service evaluations, in that the process of evaluation could take time away from limited instructional time. Kapel (1982) found it difficult to implement a pre-post design evaluation of an in-service program because the district involved would not allow time to be taken from instruction to administer the necessary evaluation instruments.

Evaluations cost money, particularly follow-up studies and classroom observations. Aside from Teacher Corps, little money has been invested by in-service programs for such activities (Lanier and Glassberg, 1981). There needs to be a recognition in the field that in order to assess in-service programs, there must be a systematic (quantitative and qualitative) evaluation of how participants' behaviors and teaching

strategies have changed as a result of the in-service, and how the changes have affected the achievement of students in their classrooms. There is no question, such studies cost money.

Aptitude X Treatment X Interaction (ATI) studies involving participants in in-service programs would help to refine the programs. These studies help to isolate those in-service treatments, approaches, and instructional strategies that are most effective, given the aptitude and personalogical variables of the participants involved and the outcomes desired (Tobias, 1982). ATI studies require planning, time, and funding, but in the long run they will contribute to making in-service programs more effective and provide a data base for future program development.

The lack of receptiveness of participants, in in-service programs, to research and evaluation may be another delimiting factor. The use of research as a means of helping solve classroom and school problems must be established in the minds of participants in order to integrate research successfully into in-service programs. Research-based in-service programs have been suggested as ways to approach the issue (Feiman, 1981; Hall and Loucks, 1981; Lanier and Glassberg, 1981). Research-based in-service can be designated to: have research findings reviewed, summarized and synthesized in relationship to particular problems in the classroom or school; approach the development of the in-service programs systematically; train participants to become facilitators of inquiry; use different approaches of research in solving problems; develop materials and strategies based on the problem; and help participants see the contributions that can be made by research directly to the classroom: in essence, use research as part of the content and

the in-service process.

The acceptance of the evaluation of in-service programs can be facilitated if the evaluation focuses on whether the in-service programs satisfy the needs of the participants (and school). Evaluation should not focus on individual participants per se, nor should evaluation be tied to the teachers' reward system, that is, status, tenure, merit, and so on. It is the in-service program that is being evaluated, not the individual; evaluation provides the measure of in-service program accountability. Evaluation should be collaborative; those being evaluated should help design and implement the process (Fox, 1981). If designed correctly, evaluation can be supportive, particularly if it takes place as part of a follow-up process. An effective practice for in-service programs is to have programs continuously evaluated (Burrello and Orbaugh, 1982); this evaluation becomes meaningful when related to student learning and the real classroom. Once teachers see that evaluation is not threatening, has become institutionalized in all in-service programs, is an important segment of in-service, is supportive, and can make in-service more responsive to their needs, they will be more accepting of evaluation.

This section has covered the broad area of in-service education, as related to the improvement of education in the urban environment. It can be seen that there is no definitive model of in-service, and that there are still many unanswered issues. Although it is difficult to state that "nearly everyone is dissatisfied," the Joyce, McNair, Diaz, and McKibbin statement of 1977 (page 60), "There are plenty of the essential ingredients for success; yet, somehow these are not being brought together effectively, and nearly everyone is dissatisfied," essentially

described in-service in 1982.

V. A Backward Glance with a Forward Thrust

Studies of black inner-city children have indicated that teachers do have impact on student achievement (Murnane, 1975). One reason for concern in this area, however, is the fact that "...communication lines between urban schools and schools of education have grown virtually silent of late" (Mackey, 1981:10). Mackey feels that teacher educators can take steps to ameliorate the situation:

1. The fact that recent historical events have changed the form of urban schooling is evident--that is, the melting pot theory is archaic. Experts from areas as diverse as sociolinguistics, industrial psychology, and urban history should be involved in making accommodations to this change in education programs. Race is, and will continue to be a central social issue for the rest of the 20th century. Here, teacher pre- and in-service training should include some means of eliminating intolerant and stereotypical responses to "real" ethnic differences.
2. Teacher educators must accept the ideological differences that exist between the urban community and the college university community. There must be continued research to uncover more about teacher thinking and behavior. (Medley in 1978 noted that the profile of an effective teacher is not always in concert with the way teachers are trained.)
3. Teacher educators should reorganize the priorities of

teacher education--programs tend to attempt too many tasks. They should concentrate on presenting material about effective teaching. Mackey suggests the implementation of experimental programs, based upon research, in highly visible urban schools. He proposes service to parents as a component of such a program. This latter step would help to lessen the disparity between the urban and college/university communities.

As was suggested in this monograph, social and demographic trends are vital to educational decision making. The school age population is dropping from a high of over 27 million in 1971 to a projected low of under 24 million by 1983 (Miel, 1981, p. 8). And yet, some cities are experiencing a renaissance. Young, mostly white, professionals are seeking to return to the inner city. Many of these individuals fear the inner-city schools where minorities still make up a larger group. This new inner-city society tends to opt for private alternatives to education. Thus, inner-city schools face a decline in total number of students with an increase in the proportion of non-white or non-English-speaking students, and students from low-income families. It is easy to see the connection between the demographic and financial situations of city schools. There will be a decrease in funds (based on public school enrollment) for urban schools through the 1980's--however, no decrease in need is projected.

Over the past decade research on effective teaching and schools has contributed much to the professional literature. The works of Smith (1971), Rosenshine anf Furst (1971), Medley (1977, 1978), Soar and Soar (1972) and others led educators to process-product research and beyond.

Edmonds (1979), Edmonds and Frederiksen (1978), Austin (1979), Lezotte et al. (1980), Lezotte (1979), Brookover (1977, 1979), and others have provided insights into what makes urban schools effective as well as how to establish positive school climates. Individual researchers have focused on particular aspects of the art of teaching and the various sciences that form the "disciplines" undergirding teaching and teacher education (pre- and in-service) related to schooling in the urban community.

Three major studies in the 70's have provided us with considerable information (Lieberman and Miller, 1981) on changing schools: (1) The Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM)--a look at the development of teachers; (2) The Rand Change Agent Study--a study of federal improvement projects; and (3) I/D/E/A--a study of change in individual schools over five years. These three studies found that improvement occurs simultaneously on the individual and school level. Findings indicate that: change within the individual teacher takes time; teachers are motivated by the belief that their actions make a difference for children; teachers must be recognized for what they do well; when program and individual concerns are similar, positive change occurs; conditions for improvement are motivated by the principal. Lieberman and Miller glean guidelines for school improvement from the three studies: (1) consider teachers as experts in the areas of teaching and learning; (2) implement a reward system; (3) encourage inter-teacher communication; and (4) accept the importance and influence of the principal.

Wood and Thompson see the decade of the 80's as a decade of staff development (1980). They have reached this conclusion because of the abundant curriculum and instruction plans spawned in the last two decades. This projection is shared by the Rand Corporation.

> However, in-service teacher training, as it is now constituted, is the slum of American education. It is disadvantaged, poverty-stricken, neglected and has little effect. Most staff development programs are irrelevant and ineffective, a waste of time and money. Disjointed workshops and courses focus on information dissemination rather than stressing the use of information or appropriate practice in the classroom. Seldom are these programs part of a comprehensive plan to achieve goals set by the school staff. (Wood and Thompson, 1980, p. 374).

In addition, Wood and Thompson suggest several reasons for the problems they perceive in staff development: (1) the negative attitudes toward and lack of satisfaction with current in-service programs; (2) the perception of teachers held by those planning in-service--they see in-service recipients as trying to avoid involvement, as needing some form of coercion to participate, and as avoiding responsibility for the in-service; (3) the tendency to focus on district-wide rather than local goals; (4) most in-service models ignore what we know about adult learning; ideas are presented for assimilation and implementation--teachers are not expected to generate the in-service model; and (5) in-service training has not modeled the good planning we expect in the classroom--that is, objectives, individualization, options, relevancy, and promotion of trust and concern.

Previous research, empirical data collected from the many experiences in the schools, and the change-agent studies, such as the Rand Corporation Studies (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975, 1978), have given rise to various approaches or models for pre- and in-service teacher education that can be used in urban schools. Teacher Corps programs, Teacher Center programs, CBTE, CBE, Project T.E.A.C.H., Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA), and others are (or have been) programs found in various urban school districts. Despite the availability of research and many in-service models, many programs reflect exclusively practical orien-

tation, too short a length of time-on-tasks, cafetria-type offerings, a lack of systematic and directed design and organization, goals and objectives so general as to be meaningless, the lack of participant accountability, and little program evaluation. Thus the use of research, and what is known about in-service models, by such pre- and in-service programs becomes moot. Given the enourmous costs expended for both pre- and in-service education in terms of effort, time, numbers participating, and dollars, and since research can indeed support such programs, research, and knowledge of current programs can make meaningful contributions to pre- and in-service education. Yet, it appears that pre- and in-service urban teacher education is still like the "many faces of Eve" --searching for the most effective approach to improve teacher preparation and training, classroom instruction, and student achievement.

The authors suggest not only increased research into effective urban teaching and schools, increased use of research in the in-service programs themselves (content and process), expanded evaluation and greater accountability, but also greater research into the most efficient means delivering what are found to be the most effective approaches to improving the education of all children in the urban community. The "national agenda for research in teacher education" described by Hall and Hord (1981) must not only be initiated, but teacher education for the urban schools must be a major target on the agenda. More research into the one-to-one relationship among delivery systems, teaching methodologies (including curriculum) and student achievement in all three domains (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor) must be expanded. Pre- and in-service education programs, whose evaluations of effectiveness are based only on participant perceptions, have little significance unless the effects are translated

into positive achievement for the clientele in the urban schools--the urban child.

We are facing a crisis in urban education. Funds are dwindling, teachers are staying on the job longer, often without revitalizing their skills, and pre- and in-service education models have presented little "hard data" as to teacher effectiveness strategies, and those strategies proved effective in isolated areas are not picked up for reevaluation and implementation by teacher education. We appear to have lost the momentum of the late 60's and 70's during the "War on Poverty" and "Great Society" era.

It seems that urban education is still fighting the battle of identification, recognition, respectability, and acceptability by the larger society (and more particularly by the larger education community). Interestingly enough, this malaise is reflected by the number of publications dealing with urban education. Only 11 books published from 1979-81 dealing specifically with either urban schools or urban education are listed by the current Subject Guide to Books in Print (1980) and Books in Print Supplement (1981). This becomes more revealing when one considers 24 books are listed from 1975-78 and 48 are listed prior to 1975. It should be noted that in these same directories, 52 for 1979-81, 99 for 1975-78, and 190 prior to 1975 are listed for texts on higher education.

Action must be taken if we are to salvage urban education. Gappert proposes the following (1981):

1. A clear coherent educational mission must be developed by community consensus.

2. Skills for collaborative planning must be identified and strengthened.

3. Incentives for institutional reconstruction should be provided.

4. There should be acknowledgement and dissemination of promising practices and model programs.

5. Communication with students, families, and communities must be strengthened.

6. The use of evaluation and research as management tools should receive top priority.

7. Patterns and practices of successful urban staff development activities should be examined.

Today, we have many choices, and the road we choose in teacher education can affect the urban schools of both the present and future. Because the drop in school enrollments has heralded a drop in pre-service education, we can now become more selective of those entering teaching and those applying for teaching positions in urban schools. Let us use what we know about effective teachers to "hone" our training and selection of newly certified urban school personnel, and let us use what we know about both effective teachers and effective schools in our in-service programs. There has been a plethora of national, state, and local experimentation in pre- and in-service education--now is the time to focus carefully on only the effective programs, and study the factors that make such programs effective. We need to continue the search for new pre- and in-service programs that will once again make the urban schools, as Passow (1982) described them as they were before the 1930's the elite of American Education.

REFERENCES

Adkins, A.
1979 "The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching." Educational Leadership 36, 5 (February):361-62.

Andrews, T.E., Houston, W. Robert, and Bryant, B.
1981 Adult Learners (A Research Study). Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators.

Austin, G.
1979 "Exemplary School and the Search for Effectiveness." Educational Leadership 37, 1 (October):10-12 ff.

"Beginning Teachers Must Make the Grade."
1981 NAEP Newsletter 14 (Summer), p. 2.

Bents, Richard H., and Howey, Kenneth R.
1978 Alternative Strategies for the Delivery of In-service. Paper presented at the National Council of States on In-service Education National Conference, San Francisco, CA, November 16-18.

Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, M.W.
1975 Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume IV. The Findings in Review (R-1589/4-HEW). Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

1978 Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume III. Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Bolam, R.
1978 Center for Educational Research of Innovation, Innovation in In-service Education and Training of Teachers, Practice and Theory. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Books in Print Supplement, 1980-81.
1981 New York: R.R. Bowker Co.

Borich, G.D.
1979 "Implications for Developing Teacher Competencies from Process-Product Research." Journal of Teacher Education 30, 1 (January-February):77-86.

Boutwell, William D.
1966 "What's Happening in Education," The PTA Magazine 60 (May): 13-14.

Brett, Arlene
1979 "Effective Classroom Management in an Inner City School." The Teacher Educator 15, 2 (Autumn):6-10.

Brookover, Wilbur
1977 Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development.

1979 School Systems and Student Achievement. New York: Praeger Publications.

Brookover, Wilbur et al.
1982 Creating Effective Schools. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.

Brophy, J.
1979 Advances in Teacher Effectiveness Research. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, March.

1982 "Successful Teaching Strategies for the Inner-City Child." Phi Delta Kappan 13, 8 (April): 527-530.

Brophy, J., and Everston, C.
1974 Process-Product Correlations in the Texas Teacher Effectiveness Study: Final Report. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka
1954 347 U.S. 483, 493.

1955 349 U.S. 294.

Browning, R. Stephen, ed.
1975 From Brown to Bradley: School Desegregation 1954-1975. Cincinnati, OH: Jefferson Law Book Co.

Budley, Pam et al.
1980 "Development and Implementation of a Clinical In-service Model." In School Improvement and In-service Education, edited by Ruben Olivarez, pp. 141-171. Texas Teacher Corps, September.

Buncher, Judith F.
1975 School Busing Controversy: 1970-75. New York: Facts on File.

Burrello, L.C., and Orbaugh, T.
1982 "Reducing the Discrepancy Between the Known and the Unknown in In-service Education. Phi Delta Kappan 63, 6 (February):385-388.

Butler, Loretta.
1978 Four Issues in Teacher In-service Education. New York: Fordham University-Lincoln Center.

Carberry, H., Waxman, B., and McKain, D.
1981 "An In-service Workshop Model for Regular Class Teachers Concerning Mainstreaming of the Learning Disabled Child." Journal of Learning Disabilities 14, 1 (1981):26-28.

Carney, M., ed.
1979 In-service Training in Desegregated School Districts: Eastern Region Case Studies. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Centra, J.A., and Potter, D.A.
1980 "School and Teacher Effects: An Interrelational Model." Review of Educational Research 50, 2:273-291.

Chase, Francis S.
1978 Urban Education Studies. Washington, D.C.: Council of Great City Schools.

1980 "Educational Revitalization: A Search for Promising Developments." In Educational Quandaries and Opportunities, edited by Francis S. Chase, p. 33. Dallas, TX: Urban Education Studies.

Clark, D.
1980 "Factors Associated with Success in Urban Elementary Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 62, 7 (March):467-470.

Coker, H., Medley, D., and Soar, R.
1980 "How Valid are Expert Opinions about Effective Teaching?" Phi Delta Kappan 62, 2 (October):131-134 ff.

Collins, Paul, ed.
1978 Teacher Corps National Conference Report. Omaha, NE: Center for Urban Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Conner, Caryl
1967 "The Teacher Corps." American Education 3 (April):13-19.

Dickson, George et al.
1972 Planning for a Performance-based Teacher Education Program: A Final Report. Toledo, OH: College of Education, University of Toledo.

DiPasquale, Vincent C.
1972 The Gary-Indiana Moorehead State College Project. Moorehead, MN: Moorehead State College.

Dumais, Mary Dean et al.
1980 Point-Counterpoint Between Federal Policy and In-service Education Programs in Teacher Corps. Chicago, IL: Center for New Schools, September.

Ebel, Robert
1982 "Three Radical Proposals for Strengthening Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 6 (February):375-578.

Edelfelt, Roy A.
1977a In-service Education, Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

1977b
"The School of Education and In-service Education." In Higher Education's Role in In-service Education, edited by Karl Massanari, pp. 7-12. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

1982 "Critical Issues in Developing Teacher Centers." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 6 (February):390-393.

Edmonds, R.R.
1979 "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37, 1 (October):15-18, ff.

Edmonds, R.R., and Frederiksen, J.R.
1978 Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools that are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Elfenbein, Iris M.
1978 Participant Instructor Planner: Perspectives on the Teacher's Role in In-service Education. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Elsass, David G.
1978 Urban Education Project. Bowling Green, OH: College of Education, Bowling Green State University.

Feiman, Sharon
1981 "Exploring Connections Between Different Kinds of Educational Research and Different Conceptions of Inservice Education." Journal of Research and Development in Education 14, 2 (Winter):11-21.

Fisher, Allen
1980 "The Effects of Feedback Instruction During Student Teaching on Performance and Attitude of Prospective Black Elementary School Teachers." The Negro Educational Review 31, 2 (April):83-88.

Fisher, C. et al.
1978 Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Technical Report Series. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Fisher, C., Marliave, R., and Filby, N.
1979 "Improving Teaching by Increasing 'Academic Learning Time'." Educational Leadership 37, 1 (October):52-54.

Florio, Dave, and Koff, Robert
1977 Model State Legislation, Continuing Professional Education of School Personnel. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Fox, G. Thomas Jr.
1981 "Purpose as Context for Evaluating In-service Programs." Journal of Research and Development in Education 14, 2 (Winter):34-35.

Frankel, Martin M.
1978 Projections of Education Statistics to 1986-87. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gage, N.
1977 The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

1978 "The Yield of Research on Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan 60, 3 (November):229-235.

Gappert, Gary
1981 "The Urban Agenda and Its Implications for Schools of Education." In Policy for the Education of Educators: Issues and Implications, edited by Georgianna Appignani, pp.78-89. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Gehrke, Nathalie
1981 "Rationale for Field Experience in the Professions." In Teacher Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Education, pp. 1-6. Summary report of the Commission of Exploratory Field Experiences of Association of Teacher Educators. Reston, VA. Association of Teacher Educators.

Gianette, Goerge, and Hodes, Phyllis.
1980 "A Cooperative Bilingual Effort in Michigan." Foreign Language Annals 13, 2 (April):93-96.

Glassberg, Salley, and Oja, Sharon
1981 "A Developmental Model for Enhancing Teachers' Personal and Professional Growth." Journal of Research and Development in Education 14, 2 (Winter):59-69.

Goldhammer, R.
1969 Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart-Winston.

Good, T. and Grouws, D.
1975 Process-Product Relationships in 4th Grade Mathematics Classes. Columbia, MO: College of Education, University of Missouri.

Grant, Merril A.
1982 "How to Desegregate-and Like It." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 8 (April), p. 539.

Grant, W. Vance, and Eiden, Leo J.
1981 Digest of Education Statistics, 1981. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Greenwood, Peter et al.
1975 Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Volume III. The Process of Change. Santa MOnica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Hall, Gene E.
1975 The Effects of "Change" on Teachers and Professors--Theory, Research and Implications for Decision Makers. A paper presented at the National Invitational Conference on Research on Teacher Effects: An Examination by Policy-Makers and Researchers, November.

Hall, Gene E., and Hord, Shirley
1981 "A National Agenda for Research in Teacher Education for the 1980's." Journal of Teacher Education 32, 2 (March-April):4-8.

Hall, Gene E., and Loucks, Susan
1981 "Program Definition and Adaptation: Implications for In-service." Journal of Research and Development in Education 14, 2 (Winter):46-57.

Hampton, Peter J.
1980 "Innovative Strategies for Teaching Low Income and Minority Students." The Teacher Educator 15, 4 (Spring):15-23.

Hawkes, Richard R.
1980 "WIP -- A Working In-service Program." NASSP Bulletin 64, 434 (March):116-119.

Heckman, Paul, and Schmidt, Neil
1978 "Teaching to Learn -- Learning to Teach." Thrust for Educational Leadership 7, 4 (March):17-19.

Hipple, T., and Christiansen, M.
1979 "From the Chair of CEE and CEE Commission on Alternative Models for Preservice and In-service Education of Teachers." English Education 2, 2 (December):118-120.

Hite, Herbert
1977 "Part One, In-service Education: Perceptions, Purpose and Practices." In Planning In-service Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives, by Herbert Hite and Kenneth R. Howey, pp. 1-20. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Horak, Willis J.
1981 "Field Experiences: Their Effects on Beliefs of Preservice Elementary Teaching." Science Education 65, 3 (July):227-284.

Hord, Shirley, and Rutherford, William I.
1980 "An Educational Change Model: Implementing Teacher Corps Innovations." In School Improvement and Inservice Education, Issues and Practices, edited by Ruben Olivares, pp. 7-34. Austin, TX: Teacher Corps Network, the University of Texas at Austin.

Howey, Kenneth R.
1977 "Part Two, A Framework for Planning Alternative Approaches to In-service Teacher Education." In Planning In-service Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives, by Herbert Hite and Kenneth Howey, pp. 21-61. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

1981 "The Concept of School-Focused In-service." In School Focused In-service: Descriptions and Discussions, edited by Kenneth Howey, Richard Bents, and Dean Corrigan, pp. 5-23. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Howey, Kenneth R., Bents, R., and Corrigan D, eds.
1981 School-Focused In-service: Descriptions and Discussions. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Hughes, Carolyn Sue
1981 "Staff Development for Building Student Thinking Skills." Educational Leadership, 39 1 (October):48-51.

Hutson, Harry M.
1981 "In-service Best Practices: The Learning of General Education." Journal of Research and Development in Education 14, 2 (Winter):1-10.

Ishler, Peggy, and Kay, Richard S.
1981 "A Survey of Institutional Practices." In Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Education pp. 15-19. Summary Report of Commission on Exploratory Field Experiences of Association of Teacher Educators. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Johnson, Jerry, and Sloat, Kim C.
1980 "Teacher Training Effects: Real or Illusory." Psychology in the Schools 17, 1 (January):109-115.

Joyce, B.R., McNair, K.M., Diaz, R., and McKibbins, M.O.
1977 "Interviews." In The In-service Teacher Education Concepts Project. Perceptions of Professionals and Policy Makers (Report No. 3), coordinated by B.R. Joyce and L.P. Peck. Syracuse, NY: National Dissemination Center.

Joyce, B.R. et al.
1976 Issues to Face, ISTE Report. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

Joyce, B.R. and Weil, M.
1978 Social Models of Teaching: Expanding Your Teacher Repertoire. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kapel, David E.
1982 Assessing A Controversial In-service Program: An Action Research Approach. Paper presented at the 1982 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, N.Y., March 19.

Katz, Lillian
1979 Helping Others Learn to Teach: Some Principles and Techniques for In-service Educators. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education.

King, Richard, and Mycio, Geri
1975 The City Teaching Center Programs of the Office of Teacher Education State University of New York at Buffalo. Buffalo, NY: State University of New York at Buffalo.

Lanier, Judy, and Glassberg, Sally
1981 "Relating Research in Classroom Teaching to In-service Education." Journal of Research and Development in Education 14, 3 (Winter):22-23.

Levine, Daniel
1982 "Successful Approaches for Improving Academic Achievement in Inner-City Elementary Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 8 (April): 523-528.

Lewis, Angelo J.
1982 "Making the Public Schools Work: Urban Education in the 80s." In Focus 9. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.

Lezotte, Lawrence W.
1979 A Policy Prospectus for Improving Urban Education. Paper presented to the Connecticut State Board of Education, July.

Lezotte, Lawrence W. et al.
1980 School Learning Climate and School Achievement. Site Specific Technical Assistance for Teacher Corps. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University.

Lieberman, Ann, and Miller, Lynne
1981 "Synthesis of Research on Improving Schools." Educational Leadership 38, 7 (April):583-586.

Lord, T. Dennis
1977 Spatial Perspectives on School Desegregation and Busing. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers.

McCormick, W.
1979 "Teachers Can Learn to Teach More Effectively." Educational Leadership 37, 1 (October):59-60.

McDonald, F. et al.
1975 Final Report on Phase II Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. California Commissions on Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McIntire, R.G., Hughes, L.W. and Say, M.W.
1982 "Houston's Successful Desegregation Plan." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 8 (April):536-538.

McLaughlin, Milbrey, and Berman, Paul
1977 "Retooling Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment." Educational Leadership 35, 3 (December):191-194.

Mackey, James.
1981 "How to Work with Urban Schools." Journal of Teacher Education (July-August):10-12.

Mahan, James M.
1980 "Reasons Reported by Preservice Teachers for Choosing or Rejecting Multicultural Field Placements." The Teacher Educator 15, 4 (Spring) 24-36.

Mann, Dale et al.
1975 Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume III: The Process of Change Appendix A. Innovations in Classroom Organization and Staff Development. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Marsh, David D.
1979 "The Classroom Effectiveness of Teacher Corps Graduates: A National Assessment." Journal of Classroom Interaction 15, 1 (Winter): 25-33.

Medley, Donald M.
1977 Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness: A Review of Process-Product Research. Washington, D.C: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

1978 "Research in Teacher Effectiveness: Where It Is and How it Got There." Journal of Classroom Interaction 13, 2:16-21.

Mendoza, Alicia, and Webb, Clark
1981 "Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggested Standards for Implementing Exploratory Field Experiences." In Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Education, Summary Report of Commission on Exploratory Field Experiences of the Association of Teacher Educators, pp. 23-29. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Miel, Alice
1981 Projected Trends in Education in the 1980's. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Miller, Stephen
1982a Presentation on Effective Schools. Paper presented at the Symposium on Effective Schools, Louisville, KY, April 22.

1982b What Research Tells Us About Effective Schools. Louisville, KY: University of Louisville. Mimeographed.

Milliken v. Bradley
1974 418 U.S. 717, 94S. Ct. 3112, 41 L.Ed. 2nd 1069.

Mills, Nicolaus, ed.
1979 Busing U.S.A. New York: Teachers College Press

Morgan, E.
1979 "Effective Teaching in the Urban High School." Urban Education 14, 2 (July):161-181.

Murnane, Richard J.
1975 The Impact of School Resources on the Learning of Inner City Children. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.

Nelson, Marilyn
1976 "Creating Organizational Structures for the In-service Training of Teachers." In ISTE Report v. Cultural Pluralism and Social Change, by Marilyn Nelson. Palo Alto, CA: In-service Teacher Education Concepts Project, sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics and Teacher Corps.

Olivárez, Rubén, ed.
1980 School Improvement and In-service Education, Issues and Practices. Austin, TX: Texas Teacher Corps Network, The University of Texas at Austin.

Orfield, Gary
1978 Must We Bus? Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Ornstein, Allan.
1982 "Redefining the Urban Problem." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 8 (April): 516-519.

Ornstein, Allan, and Levine, D.
1981 "Strategies for Reforming Metropolitan Schools." Urban Education 16, 1 (April):93-107.

Palladino, J.
1979 "Verbal Interaction in Urban Schools." Urban Education, 14, 3 (October):353-358.

Passow, A. Harry
1982 "Urban Education for the 1980s: Trends and Issues." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 8 (April):519-522.

Perez, Bertha
1980 "School Learning Climate and Community Based Education." In School Improvement and In-service Education, edited by Ruben Olivarez, pp. 99-108. Austin, TX: Texas Teacher Corps Network.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Green, Robert L.
1979 "School Desegregation in Large Cities: A Critique of the Coleman 'White Flight' Thesis." In Busing, U.S.A., edited by Nico'aus Mills, pp.132-201. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pisaro, Samuel E.
1966 "National Teacher Corps -- Win, Lose or Draw?" Phi Delta Kappan 47, 4 (December):162-165.

Powell, C., and Winecoff, Larry
1977 "The Community Development Center: A New Perspective on Meeting Program, Staff, and Community Needs." In In-service Education: Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs, edited by Roy Edelfelt, pp. 75-82. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

Powell, M.
1979 "New Evidence for Old Truths." Educational Leadership 37, 1 (October):49-51.

PSD, Policy and Procedures, 1981-82.
1981 Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Public Schools.

Ravitch, Diane
1979 "The 'White Flight' Controversy." In Busing U.S.A., edited by Nicolaus Mills, pp. 238-255. New York: Teachers College Press.

Roper, Susan S., and Nolan, Robert R.
1977 Down From the Ivory Tower: A Model of Collaborative In-service Education. Occasional Paper #16. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

Rosenshine, B.
1976 "Classroom Instruction." In The Psychology of Teaching Methods, Seventy-fifth Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education, Part I, edited by N.L. Gage, pp. 335-371. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rosenshine, B., and Furst, N.
1971 "Research on Teacher Performance Criteria." In Research in Teacher Education, edited by B.O. Smith, pp. 37-72. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rossell, Christine H.
1979 "School Desegregation and White Flight." In Busing U.S.A., edited by Nicolaus Mills, pp. 214-237. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sarment, A.H.
1981 Handbook for Review and Validation of Teacher Corps Products and Practices. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Schurr, Terry, and Sciara, Frank
1977 The I STA/RCPSS Professional Education Needs Assessment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Indiana Education Research Association, Indianapolis, IN, November.

Shoemaker, Joan, and Fraser, Hugh W.
1981 "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications of Effective Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan 63, 3 (November):178-182.

Simms, R. et al.
1975 The West Dallas Teacher Education Program. Denton, TX: North Texas State University.

Sizemore, Robert W.
1981 "Do Black and White Students Look for the Same Characteristics in Teachers?" Journal of Negro Education 50, 1 (Winter):48-53.

Smith, B.O., ed.
1971 Research in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Smith, Lehi T., and Haley, J.M.
1981 "In-service Education: Teacher Response and Student Achievement." School Science and Mathematics 81, 3 (March):189-194.

Soar, R., and Soar R.
1972 "An Empirical Analysis of Selected Follow-Through Programs. An Example of a Process Aproach to Evaluation." In Early Childhood Education, Seventy-first Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education, Part II, edited by I. Gordon, pp. 229-259. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sparks, Dennis.
1982 "A Comprehensive Teacher Center Program. Phi Delta Kappan 63, 6 (February):395-597.

Steffenson, James P.
1975 "Teacher Corps: A Nervous Decade of Educational Innovation." Journal of Teacher Education 26, 4 (Summer):110-111.

Stevens, Dorothy Jo
1982 "Mathematics Methods: Pre-Student Teaching Model." Journal of Teacher Education 33, 1 (January-February):18-21.

Stokey, Robert E.
1977 "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation." In Curriculum and Evaluation, edited by A.A. Bellack and H.M. Kliebard, pp. 372-390. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Subject Guide to Books in Print, 1980-81, Volume 2.
1980 New York: R.R. Bowker Co.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
1971 402 U.S. 1.

Sweeney, James
1982 "Research Synthesis on Effective Schooling Leadership." Educational Leadership 39, 5 (February):346-352.

Taylor, G.
1981 "Findings from Research on Teacher Effectiveness." The Reading Teacher 34, 6 (March):726-730.

Teacher Corps Reports
undated In-service Development Process, A Planning Process for In-service Education, Western Washington State College. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

undated In-service Development Process, An In-service Model for an Urban/Suburban System, Arlington Public Schools, Virginia, Parts I II, and III. Arlington, VA: Arlington Public Schools.

Tikunoff, William J., Ward, Beatrice A., and Griffin, Gary A.
1981 "Interactive Research and Development as a Form of Professional Growth." In School Focused In-service: Descriptions and Discussions, edited by Kenneth Howey et al., pp. 187-213. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Tobias, Sigmund
1982 "When Do Instructional Models Make a Difference?" Educational Researcher 2, 4 (April):4-9.

Walter, James E.
1981 "Successful Program Implementation in Urban Schools." Educational Leadership 38, 8 (May):635-638.

Walton, Susan
1981 "Louisiana Launches State Teacher-Improvement Program." Education Week 1, 8 (October), p. 5.

Watson, B.
1979 "Urban Education: Past, Present, and Future." In Urban Schools in Urban Systems, edited by Gary Gappert, pp. 1-21. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Weaver, W. Timothy.
1981 "Demography, Quality and Decline: The Challenge for Schools of Education in the 1980s." In Policy for the Education of Educators, edited by Georgianna Appignani, pp. 50-65. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Weber, G.
1971 Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.

Wegher, Barbara
1976 Ten Years of Teacher Corps, 1966-1976. From the Field. Los Angeles, CA: Teacher Corps Recruitment and Referral Center.

Wilson, Angene.
1979 "Multicultural Experiences, Global Perspective and Teacher Education." The Teacher Educator 15, 2 (Autumn):29-33.

Wilson, Robert, and Blum, Irene
1981 "Evaluating Teachers' Use of In-service Training." Educational Leadership 38, 6 (March):490-491.

Winnipeg, Centre Project.
1973 Project Manitoba. Canada: Manitoba Department of Education.

Wittes, Simon, and Cooper, Laura
1977 "The Curley School: An In-service Education Program." In In-service Education: Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs, edited by Roy A. Edelfelt, pp. 93-100. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College.

Wood, Fred, and Thompson, Steven R.
1980 "Guidelines for Better Staff Development." Educational Leadership 37, 5 (February):374-378.

Wynee, E.
1980 Looking at Teaching. Lexington, MA: Heath and Co.

Yarger, Sam.
1976 ISTE, Report IV, Creative Authority and Collaboration. Palo Alto, CA: National Center for Education Statistics and the Teacher Corps.

Zahorik, J.A.
1981 "Using Insights in Education." Journal of Teacher Education 32, 2 (March-April):10-13.